DATE DUE

Property of
FAMILY OF FAITH
LIBRARY

Property of
FAMILY OF FAITH
LIBRARY

Ex Libris

COMMENTARY

ON THE

GOSPEL OF JOHN

WITH AN

HISTORICAL AND CRITICAL INTRODUCTION

BY

F. GODET,

DOCTOR IN THEOLOGY AND PROFESSOR IN THE FACULTY OF THE INDEPENDENT CHURCH OF NEUCHÂTEL.

VOL. I.

Property of
FAMILY OF FAI
LIBRARY

TRANSLATED FROM THE THIRD FRENCH EDITION

WITH A

PREFACE, INTRODUCTORY SUGGESTIONS,

AND ADDITIONAL NOTES

12055

BY

TIMOTHY DWIGHT,

PROFESSOR OF SACRED LITERATURE IN YALE COLLEGE.

NEW YORK:
FUNK & WAGNALLS, PUBLISHERS,
18 AND 20 ASTOR PLACE,
1890.

[*All Rights Reserved.*]

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1886,
By FUNK & WAGNALLS,
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

PREFACE

TO THE AMERICAN EDITION.

THE Commentary on the Gospel of John which is now presented, in its third edition, to American readers, has been well known to New Testament scholars for twenty years. It was originally published in 1864–5, and immediately commanded attention. Ten or eleven years later an enlarged and greatly improved edition was issued, which was soon afterwards translated into English. The first volume of the third edition was given to the public in 1881; the second and third volumes have appeared during the present year (1885). Unlike most of the German commentators of recent days, Godet has, with each new edition, not simply revised what he had written at an earlier date, but, in large measure, prepared a new work. This is very strikingly true of the introductory volume of this latest edition of the original, which covers the first two hundred and nineteen pages of this translation. It is also true, as the reader who compares the two with minute study will perceive, that in the commentary properly so called every paragraph has been subjected to careful examination, and even where the matter is not altogether new, sentences have been very largely re-written, with changes sometimes of importance to the thought and sometimes apparently only for purposes of style. That the work has been greatly improved by these new labors of the author will be admitted by all who read the second and third editions in connection with each other. It may be almost said, that as great a service has been rendered by the additions and revisions since the book was first issued as was rendered by its original publication. Among the commentaries on this Gospel, this may be ranked as one of the best—a book which every student and minister may well examine, both for the light which it throws upon this

most deeply interesting portion of the New Testament and for its suggestiveness to Christian thought.

When the proposal was first made to publish a new translation in this country, it was supposed that it would be ready for publication at a considerably earlier date. But soon after the work was undertaken, it was ascertained that the second and third volumes of the third edition would appear in Switzerland in 1885, and it was accordingly deemed best to await their issue. Advance sheets were kindly forwarded by the author as soon as they were printed—the preparation of this American edition being the result of consultation with him and having his approval. The present volume contains one half of the book, including the General Introduction (Vol. I.) of the original, and the Commentary as far as the end of the fifth chapter of the Gospel, or about four-fifths of Vol. II. The remainder of the translation, it is expected, will be published about the first of July, 1886.

Of the work of the American editor a few words may be said. With reference to the translation I may be allowed to state two things: 1. That my endeavor has been rather to place before the reader the exactness of the author's thought, than to make prominent the matter of English style. In this sense, I have sought to give a literal, rather than an elegant rendering of the original. I have, however, as I trust, not altogether failed in making a readable book, which may represent faithfully in all respects what Godet gave to his French readers. 2. A translation of the first volume of the third edition of the French work (pp. 1–219 of this vol.) was published in connection with the Edinburgh translation of the second edition about two years ago. It was not in my hands, however, until my own translation was finished. In the final revision of my work, as the volume was about to be printed, I compared it with this translation, and in a few instances, of no special significance, I allowed myself to be affected by it in the choice of a word. For anything of this kind as connected with the English work in its second or third edition, or with the German translation of the second edition which was in my hands, but which being not altogether on the plan of my own, I used very little, I would make whatever acknowledgment may be due. The statement already made, however, will show that my work was done independently, and that if correspondences in phrase-

ology with the English translation occur, they are due to the fact that a substantially literal conformity to the French has been attempted both by the English translator and myself.

In the limited number of pages allowed me for additions to Godet's work, I have, at the end of the volume, inserted some introductory remarks on a certain part of the internal argument for the genuineness of the fourth Gospel, and also some additional annotations on the first five chapters. I would ask the reader's considerate attention to all the suggestions contained in these additional pages.

To the students and graduates of the Divinity School of Yale College I dedicate my part of this volume and the one which is to follow it, bearing with me always a most kindly feeling toward them and a most pleasant remembrance of their friendship for me.

TIMOTHY DWIGHT.

New Haven. Dec. 25th, 1885.

PREFACE

TO THE THIRD FRENCH EDITION.

I AM permitted for the third time to present to the Church this Commentary on the book which seems to me to be its most precious jewel, on the narrative of the life of Jesus in which His most intimate friend has included his most glorious and most sacred recollections. I feel all the responsibility of this office, but I know also the beauty of it; and I at once humble myself and rejoice.

God has blessed the publication of this Commentary beyond all that I was able to imagine when I wrote it for the first time. To do something, in my weakness, for the Church of France—the noblest branch, perhaps, which the tree that came from the *grain of mustard-seed* has put forth, but whose position seems to me more serious at this hour than in the days of bloody persecution,—this was all my ambition; it appeared to me even to border upon presumption. And now I receive from many quarters testimonies of affectionate sympathy and intimate communion of spirit, and I see this work translated into German, English, Dutch, Danish, Swedish, and exerting its influence far beyond the circle which I had proposed to myself to reach. God has done, according to the expression of the apostle, more than all that I was able to *ask* or even to *think*.

In the preceding edition, I had completely remodelled the treatment of the critical questions, by uniting all the discussions relative to the origin of the fourth Gospel in a special volume. This arrangement has been maintained; nevertheless, there is scarcely a page, scarcely a phrase of the preceding edition which has not been recast, and, as it were, composed anew. The reason of this fact is found, not only in the profound sense which I had of the imperfections of the previous work,

but also in the appearance of recent works which I was obliged to take into the most special consideration. I allude particularly to the *Théologie johannique* of M. Reuss, in his great work on *La Bible* (1879), to the essay of M. Sabatier in the *Encyclopédie des sciences religieuses*, t. vii. pp. 173–195 (1879), to the sixth volume of M. Renan's book on the *Origines du christianisme* (1879), and to the last edition of Hase's work, *Geschichte Jesu* (1876).

The result of this renewed study has been in my case the ever more firm *scientific* conviction of the authenticity of the writing which the Church has handed down to us under the name of John. There is a conviction of a different nature which forms itself in the heart on the simple reading of such a book. This conviction does not grow up; it is immediate, and consequently complete, from the first moment. It resembles confidence and love at first sight, that decisive impression to the integrity of which thirty years of common life and mutual devotion add nothing.

Scientific study cannot form a bond like this; what it can do is only to remove the hostile pressure which threatens to loosen or to break it. Truly, I can say that I have never felt this scientific assurance so confirmed as after this new examination of the proofs on which it rests and the reasons recently alleged against it.

The reader will judge whether this is an amiable illusion; whether the conclusion formulated at the end of this volume is indeed the result of a profound and impartial study of the facts, or whether it has only been reached because it was desired in advance. It seems to me that I can, with yet more confidence than before, submit my book to this test.

May all that which passed from the heart of Jesus into the heart and the writing of John communicate itself abundantly to my readers, so that the wish of the Holy Apostle may be accomplished in them: "We write these things unto you, that your joy may be full."

Neuchâtel, June 29th, 1881.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	Page
Preface to the American Edition,	iii
Preface to the Third French Edition,	vii
Preliminaries,	1
Chap. I. The Evangelical Literature,	3
Chap. II. History of the Johannean Discussion,	8
The Adversaries,	8
The Defenders,	20
The Intermediate Positions,	26
Conclusion,	27
Book I. The Apostle St. John,	29
In his father's house,	29
As a follower of Jesus,	30
At the head of the Judæo-Christian Church,	35
In Asia Minor,	38
His Death,	51
Book II. The Fourth Gospel,	54
Chap. I. Analysis,	54
Chap. II. Characteristics,	66
§ 1. The narrative,	66
I. The governing idea,	66
II. The facts,	68
III. The discourses,	93
A. Relation of the idea of the Logos to the discourses and the narrative,	94
B. Objections against the historical character of the discourses,	97
Internal difficulties,	98
Relation of the discourses to the Prologue and I John,	104
Differences from the Synoptics,	108
C. The Person of Jesus,	123
Conclusion,	127
§ 2. Relation to the Old Testament,	127
§ 3. The style,	134
Conclusion,	138

PAGE

BOOK III. THE ORIGIN, ... 139

Chap. I. The Time, ... 140
From 160–170, ... 141
From 130–155, ... 147
From 110–125, ... 157
Result, ... 167

Chap. II. The Author, ... 167
§ 1. Testimonies, ... 168
§ 2. Objections, ... 171
§ 3. Internal Proof, ... 197
§ 4. Contrary Hypotheses, ... 204

Chap. III. The Place, ... 208

Chap. IV. The Occasion and Aim, ... 209

Summary and Conclusion, ... 216
Commentary.—Chapters I.—V., ... 220
Introductory Suggestions by the American Editor, ... 493
Additional Notes by the American Editor, ... 513

[The Authorized English Version and the Revised Version are designated in the Additional Notes by the letters A. V. and R. V.]

PRELIMINARIES.

EVERY book is a mystery of which the author alone has the secret. The preface may, no doubt, lift a corner of the veil; but there are books without a preface, and the writer may not tell the whole truth. It belongs to literary criticism, as it is understood at the present day,[1] to solve the problem offered to the world by every work which is worthy of attention. For a book is not fully intelligible except so far as the obscurity of its origin is dissipated.

The science which is commonly called *Sacred Criticism* or *Introduction to the Old and the New Testament* was instituted by the Church, to fulfill this task with regard to the books which contain the object of its faith and the standards of its development. By placing in a clear light the origin of each one of these writings and thus revealing its primal thought, it has as its office to shed upon their whole contents the ray of light which illumines their minutest details.

According to Schleiermacher, the ideal of Sacred Criticism consists in putting the present reader in the place of the original reader,[2] by procuring for him through the artifice of science, the preliminary knowledge which the latter, as a matter of course, possessed. However valuable a result like this may be, it seems to me that criticism should propose to itself a yet more elevated aim. Its true mission is to transport the reader into the very mind of the author, at the time when he conceived or elaborated his work, and to cause him to be present at the composition of the book almost after the manner of the spectator who is present at the casting of a bell, and who, after having beheld the metal in a state of fusion in the furnace, sees the torrent of fire flow into the mold in which it is to receive its permanent form. This ideal includes that of Schleiermacher. For one of the essential elements present to the mind of the author at the time when he prepares his work, is certainly the idea which

[1] By Sainte-Beuve, for example.

[2] *Einleitung ins N. T.*, herausg. von Wolde, p. 7.

he forms of his readers, and of their condition and wants. To identify oneself with him is, therefore, at the same time to identify oneself with them.

To attain this object, or, at least, to approach it as nearly as possible, Criticism makes use of two sorts of means: 1. Those which it borrows from the history, and especially from the literary history, of the time which witnessed the publication of the sacred writings, or which followed it; 2. Those which it derives from the book itself.

Among the former we rank, first of all, the positive statements which Jewish or Christian antiquity has transmitted to us respecting the composition of one or another of our Biblical writings; then, the quotations or reminiscences of any passages of these books, which are met with in subsequent writers, and which prove their existence and influence at a certain date; finally, the historical facts to which these writings have stood in the relation of cause or effect. These are the *external* data.

To the second class belong all the indications, contained in the book itself, respecting the person of its author, and respecting the circumstances in which he labored and the motive which impelled him to write. These are the *internal* data.

To combine these two classes of data, for the purpose of drawing from them, if possible, a harmonious result—such is the work of Criticism.

This is the task which we undertake with regard to one of the most important books of the New Testament and of the whole Bible. Luther is reported to have said that if a tyrant succeeded in destroying the Holy Scriptures and only a single copy of the Epistle to the Romans and of the Gospel of John escaped him, Christianity would be saved. He spoke truly; for the fourth Gospel presents the object of the Christian faith in its most perfect splendor, and the Epistle to the Romans describes the way of faith which leads to this object, with an incomparable clearness. What need of more to preserve Christ to the world and to give birth ever anew to the Church?

The following will be the course of our study. After having cast a general glance at the formation of our Gospel literature, we shall trace the course of the discussions relative to the composition of the fourth Gospel. These will be the subjects of two preliminary chapters.

Then, we shall enter upon the study itself, which will include the following subjects:

1. The life of the apostle to whom the fourth Gospel is generally ascribed.

2. The analysis and distinctive characteristics of this writing.

3. The circumstances of its composition:

Its date;

The place of its origin;

Its author;

The aim which the author pursued in composing it.

After having studied each of these points, as separately as possible from one another, we shall bring together the particular results thus obtained in a general view, which, if we have not taken a wrong path, will offer the solution of the problem.

Jesus has promised to His Church the Spirit of truth to lead it into all the truth. It is under the direction of this guide that we place ourselves.

CHAPTER FIRST.

A GLANCE AT THE FORMATION OF THE GOSPEL LITERATURE.

Our first three Gospels certainly have a common origin, not only in that all three relate one and the same history, but also by reason of the fact that an elaboration of this history, of some sort, was already in existence at the time of their composition, and has stamped with a common impress the three narratives. Indeed, the striking agreement between them which is easily observed both in the general plan and in certain series of identical accounts, and finally in numerous clauses which are found exactly the same in two of these writings, or in all the three—this general and particular agreement renders it impossible to question that, before being thus recorded, the history of Jesus had already been cast in a mold where it had received the more or less fixed form in which we find it in our three narratives. Many think that this primitive gospel type consisted of a written document—either one of our three Gospels, of which the other two were only a free reproduction, or one or even two writings, now lost, from which our evangelists, all three of them, drew. This hypothesis of written sources has been, and is still presented under the most varied forms. We do not think that in any form it can be accepted; for it always leads to the adoption of the view, that the later writer sometimes willfully altered his model by introducing changes of real gravity, at other times adopted the course of copying with the utmost literalness, and that while frequently applying these two opposite methods in one and the same verse; and, finally, at still other times, that he made the text which he used undergo a multitude of modifications which are ridiculous by

reason of being insignificant. Let any one consult a Synopsis,[1] and the thing will be obvious. Is it psychologically conceivable that serious, believing writers, convinced of the supreme importance of the subject of which they were treating, adopted such methods with regard to it; and, above all, that they applied them to the reproduction of the very teachings of the Lord Jesus?—Common as, even at the present day, this manner of explaining the relation between our three Gospels is, we are convinced that Criticism will finally renounce it as a moral impossibility.

The simple and natural solution of the problem appears to us to be indicated by the book of Acts, in the passage where it speaks to us of the *teaching of the apostles*,[2] as one of the foundations on which the Church of Jerusalem was built (ii. 42). In this primitive apostolic teaching, the accounts of the life and death of Jesus surely occupied the first place. These narratives, daily repeated by the apostles, and by the evangelists instructed in their school, must speedily have taken a form more or less fixed and settled, not only as to the tenor of each account, but also as to the joining together of several accounts in one group, which formed ordinarily the subject-matter of a single teaching. What we here affirm is not a pure hypothesis. St. Luke tells us, in the preface of his Gospel (the most ancient document respecting this subject which we possess), of the first written accounts of the evangelic facts as composed "according to the story which they transmitted to us who were witnesses of them from the beginning, and who became ministers of the Word." These *witnesses* and *first ministers* can only have been the apostles. Their accounts conveyed to the Church by oral teaching had passed, therefore, just as they were, into the writings of those who first wrote them out. The pronoun *us* employed by Luke, shows that he ranked himself among the writers who were instructed by the oral testimony of the apostles.

The primitive apostolic tradition is thus the type, at once fixed, and yet within certain limits malleable, which has stamped with its ineffaceable imprint our first three Gospels. In this way a satisfactory explanation is afforded, on the one side, of the general and particular resemblances which make these three writings, as it were, one and the same narrative; and, on the other, of the differences which we observe among them, from those which are most considerable to those which are most insignificant.

These three works are, thus, three workings-over—wrought independently of one another—of the primitive tradition formulated in the midst of the Palestinian churches, and ere long repeated in all the countries of the

[1] An edition presenting the three texts in three parallel columns. [2] Διδαχὴ τῶν ἀποστόλων.

world. They are three branches proceeding from the same trunk, but branches which have grown out under different conditions and in different directions; and herein lies the explanation of the peculiar physiognomy of each of the three books.

In the first, the Gospel of St. Matthew, we find the matter of the preaching of the Twelve at Jerusalem preserved in the form which approaches nearest to the primitive type. This fact will appear quite simple, if we hold that this writing was designed for the Jewish people, and therefore precisely for the circle of readers with a view to which the oral preaching had been originally formulated. The dominant idea in the Palestinian preaching must have been that of the Messianic dignity of Jesus. This is also the thought which forms the unity of the first Gospel. It is inscribed at the beginning of the book as its programme.[1] The formula: *that it might be fulfilled*, which recurs, like a refrain, throughout the entire narrative, recalls this primal idea at every moment; finally it breaks forth into the full light of day in the conclusion, which brings us to contemplate the full realization of the Messianic destiny of the Lord.[2] With what purpose was this redaction of the primitive apostolic testimony published? Evidently the author desired to address a last appeal to that people, whom their own unbelief was leading to ruin. This book was composed, therefore, at the time when the final catastrophe was preparing. A word of Jesus (Matt. xxiv. 15) in which He enjoins upon His disciples to flee to the other side of the Jordan as soon as the war should break out, is reported by the author with a significant *nota bene*,[3] which confirms the date that we have just indicated.

Already twenty years before this, the preaching of the Gospel had passed beyond the boundaries of Palestine and penetrated the Gentile world. Numerous churches, almost all of them composed of a small nucleus of Jews, and a multitude of Gentiles grouped around them, had arisen at the preaching of the Apostle Paul and his fellow-laborers. This immense work could not in the end dispense with the solid foundation which had been laid at the beginning by the Twelve and the evangelists in Palestine and Syria: the connected narrative of the acts, the teachings, the death and the resurrection of Jesus. In this fact lay the imperative want which gave birth to our third Gospel, drawn up by one of the most

[1] Matt. i. 1: "Genealogy of Jesus *Christ* (*Messiah*)."

[2] xxviii. 18: "All power hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth."

[3] "When ye shall see the abomination of desolation . . . standing in the holy place—LET HIM THAT READETH UNDERSTAND! then let them that are in Judea flee unto the mountains."

eminent companions of the apostle of the Gentiles, St. Luke. The Messianic dignity of Jesus, and the argument drawn from the prophecies, had no more, in the estimation of the Gentiles, the same importance as with the Jews: all this is omitted in the third Gospel. It was as the Saviour of humanity that Jesus needed especially be presented to them; with this purpose, Luke, after having gathered the most exact information, sets in relief, in his representation of our Lord's earthly ministry, everything that had marked the salvation which He introduced as a *gratuitous* and *universal* salvation. Hence the agreement, which is so profound, between this Gospel and the writings of St. Paul. What the former traces out historically, the latter expounds theoretically. But, notwithstanding these differences as compared with the work of Matthew, the Gospel of Luke rests always, as the author himself declares in his preface, on the apostolic tradition formulated at the beginning by the Twelve. Only he has sought to complete it and to give it a more strict arrangement[1] with a view to cultivated Gentiles, such as Theophilus, who demanded a more consecutive and profound teaching.

Was a third form possible? Yes; this traditional type, preserved in its rigid and potent originality by the first evangelist with a view to the Jewish people, enriched and completed by the third with a view to the churches of the Gentile nations, might be published anew in its primitive form, as in the first Gospel, but this time with a view to Gentile readers, as in the third,—and such, in fact, is the Gospel of Mark. This work does not have any of the precious supplements which that of Luke had added to the Palestinian preaching; in this point it is allied to the first Gospel. But, on the other hand, it omits the numerous references to the prophecies and most of the long discourses of Jesus addressed to the people and their rulers, which give to the Gospel of Matthew its so decidedly Jewish character; besides, it adds detailed explanations respecting the Jewish customs which are not found in Matthew, and which are evidently intended for Gentile readers. Thus allied, therefore, to Luke by its destination and to Matthew by its contents, it is, as it were, the connecting link between the two preceding forms. This intermediate position is made clear by the first word of the work: "Gospel of Jesus, the *Christ* (Messiah), *Son of God*." The title of *Christ* recalls the special relation of Jesus to the Jewish people; that of *Son of God*, which marks the myste-

[1] i. 3: "I have thought it fit, after having accurately traced the course of all things, to write unto thee in order, that thou mightest know the certainty of the instructions which thou hast received."

rious relation between God and this unique man, raises this being to such a height that His appearance and His work must necessarily have for their object the entire human race. To this first word of the book answers also the last, which shows us Jesus continuing from heaven to discharge throughout the whole world that function of celestial messenger, of divine evangelist, which He had begun to exercise on the earth. Let us notice also a distinctive characteristic of this narrative: in each picture, so to speak, there are found strokes of the pencil which belong to it peculiarly and which betray an eye-witness. They are always, at the foundation, the traditional accounts, but evidently transmitted by a witness who had himself taken part in the scenes related, and who, when recounting them by word of mouth, quite naturally mingled in them points of detail suggested by the vividness of his own recollections.

As such do our first three Gospels present themselves to attentive readers—being called *Synoptic* because the three narratives may without much difficulty be placed, with a view to a comparison with one another, in three parallel columns. The date of their composition must have been nearly the same (between the years 60 and 70). Indeed, the first is, as it were, the last apostolic summons addressed to the people of Israel before their destruction; the third is designed to give to the preaching of St. Paul in the Gentile world its historical basis; and the second is the reproduction of the preachings of a witness carrying to the Gentile world the primitive Palestinian Gospel proclamation. If the composition of these three writings really took place at nearly the same time and in different countries, this fact accords with the opinion expressed above, that the writings were composed each one independently of the two others.

Did the Church possess in these three monuments of the primitive popular preaching of the Gospel that by which it could fully answer the wants of believers who had not known the Lord? Must there not have been in the ministry of Jesus a large number of elements which the apostles had not been able to introduce into their missionary preaching? Had they not, by reason of the elementary, and in some sort catechetical nature of that teaching of the earliest times, been led to eliminate many of the sayings of Jesus which reached beyond such a level and rose to a height where only the most advanced minds could follow Him? This is, in itself, very probable. We have already seen that a mass of picturesque details, which are wanting in Matthew, more vividly color the ancient popular tradition in Mark. The important additions in Luke prove still more eloquently how the richness of the ministry of Jesus

passed beyond the measure of the primitive oral tradition. Why may not an immediate witness of Jesus' ministry have felt himself called to rise once above all these traditional accounts, to draw directly from the source of his own recollections, and, while omitting all the scenes already sufficiently known, which had passed into the ordinary narrative, to trace, at a single stroke, the picture of the moments which were most marked, most impressive to his own heart, in the ministry of his Master? There was not in this, as we can well understand, any deliberate selection, any artificial distribution. The division of the evangelic matter was the natural result of the historical circumstances in which the founding of the Church was accomplished.

This course of things is so simple that it is, in some sort, its own justification. The apostolic origin of the fourth Gospel may be disputed, but it cannot be denied by any one that the situation indicated is probable, and the part assigned to the author of such a writing natural. It remains to be discovered whether in this case the probable is *real*, and the natural *true*. This is precisely the question which we have to elucidate.

CHAPTER SECOND.

THE DISCUSSIONS RELATING TO THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

In the rapid review which is to follow, we might unite in a single series arranged chronologically all the writings, to whatever tendency they belong, in which the subject which occupies us has been treated. But it seems preferable to us, with a view to clearness, to divide the authors whom we have to enumerate into three distinct series: 1. The partisans of the entire spuriousness of our Gospel; 2. The defenders of its absolute authenticity; 3. The advocates of some intermediate position.[1]

I.

Until the end of the seventeenth century, the question had not even been raised. It was known that, in the primitive Church, a small sect, of which Irenæus and Epiphanius make mention, ascribed the fourth Gospel to Cerinthus, the adversary of the Apostle John at Ephesus. But the

[1] It is evident that this division cannot be fixed with absolute strictness, so varied are the different ways of viewing the subject.—In order to the revision and completion of this list we have, in this new edition, taken advantage of the excellent work of Mr. Caspar René Gregory (Leipsic, 1875), published as a supplement to Luthardt's Commentary.

science of theologians, as well as the feeling of the Church, confirmed the conviction of the first Christian communities and their leaders, who saw in it unanimously the work of that apostle.

Some attacks of little importance, proceeding from the English Deistic party, which flourished two centuries ago, opened the conflict. But it did not break out seriously until a century later. In 1792, the English theologian, *Evanson*, raised note-worthy objections, for the first time, against the general conviction.[1] He rested especially on the differences between our Gospel and the Apocalypse. He ascribed the composition of the former of these books to some Platonic philosopher of the second century.

The discussion was not long in being transplanted to Germany. Four years after Evanson, *Eckermann*[2] contended against the authenticity, while yet agreeing that certain Johannean redactions must have formed the first foundation of our Gospel. These notes had been amalgamated with the historical traditions which the author had gathered from the lips of John.—Eckermann retracted in 1807.[3]

Several German theologians continued the conflict which was entered upon at this time. The contradictions between this Gospel and the other three were alleged, also the exaggerated character of the miracles, the metaphysical tone of the discourses, the evident affinities between the theology of the author and that of Philo, the scarcity of traces in literature proving the existence of this writing in the second century.[4] From 1801, the cause of the authenticity seemed already so far compromised that a German superintendent, *Vogel*, believed himself able to summon the evangelist John and his interpreters to the bar of the last judgment.[5] However, it was yet only the first phase of the discussion, the time of the skirmishes which form the prelude of great pitched battles.

It was also a German superintendent who opened the second period of the discussion. In a work which became celebrated and was published in 1820, *Bretschneider* brought together all the objections previously raised and added to them new ones.[6] He especially developed with force the objection drawn from the contradictions in our Gospel as compared with the three preceding ones, both with reference to the form of the discourses and in respect to the very substance of the Christological teaching. The fourth Gospel

[1] *The dissonance of the four generally received evangelists*, etc.

[2] *Theologische Beiträge*, vol. v. 1796.

[3] *Erklärung aller dunkeln Stellen des. N. T.*

[4] Horst (1803), Cludius (1808), Ballenstädt (1812), etc.

[5] *Der Evangelist Johannes und seine Ausleger von dem jüngsten Gericht.*

[6] *Probabilia de evangelii et epistolarum Johannis apostoli indole et origine.*

must, according to his view, have been the work of a presbyter of Gentile, probably of Alexandrian origin, who lived in the first half of the second century. This learned and vigorous attack of Bretschneider called forth numerous replies, of which we shall speak later, and following upon which this theologian declared (in 1824) that the replies which had been made to his book were "more than sufficient,"[1] and (in 1828) that he had attained the end which he had proposed to himself: that of calling out a more searching demonstration of the authenticity of the fourth Gospel.[2]

But the seeds sown by such a work could not be uprooted by these rather equivocal retractions, which had a purely personal value. From 1824, the cause of the unauthenticity was pleaded anew by *Rettig*.[3] The author of the Gospel is a disciple of John. The apostle himself certainly was not so far wanting in modesty as to designate himself as "the disciple whom Jesus loved." *De Wette* in his *Introduction* published for the first time in 1826, without positively taking sides against the authenticity, confessed the impossibility of demonstrating it by unanswerable proofs. In the same year, *Reuterdahl*, following the footsteps of Vogel, assailed the tradition of John's sojourn in Asia Minor as fictitious.[4]

The publication of *Strauss' Life of Jesus*, in 1835, had, at first, a much more decisive influence upon the criticism of the history of Jesus than upon that of the *documents* in which this history has been transmitted to us. Evidently Strauss had not devoted himself to a special study of the origin of these latter. He started, as concerning the Synoptics, from the two theories of Gieseler and Griesbach, according to which our Gospels are the redaction of the apostolic tradition, which, after having for a long time circulated in a purely oral form, at length slowly established itself in our Synoptics (Gieseler); and this, first, in the redactions of Matthew and Luke, then, in that of Mark, which is only a compilation of the two others (Griesbach). As to John, he allowed as valid the reasons alleged by Bretschneider: insufficient attestation in the primitive Church, contents contradictory of those of the first three gospels, etc. And if, in his third edition, in 1838, he acknowledged that the authenticity was less indefensible to his view, he was not slow in retracting this concession in the following edition (1840). Indeed, the least evasion in regard to this point shook his entire hypothesis of mythical legends. The axiom which lies at its foundation: The ideal does not exhaust itself in one individual,

[1] In Tzschirner's *Magazin für christliche Prediger*.

[2] *Handbuch der Dogmatik*, pp. viii. and 268.

[3] *Ephemerides exegetico-theologicæ*, I., p. 62 ff.

[4] In his work *de Fontibus historiæ Eusebianæ*.

would be proved false, provided that the fourth Gospel contained, in however small a measure, the narrative of an eye-witness. Nevertheless, the immense commotion produced in the learned world by Strauss' work soon reacted upon the criticism of the Gospels.

Christian Hermann Weisse drew attention especially to the close connection between the criticism of the history of Jesus and that of the writings in which it has been preserved.[1] He contended against the authenticity of our Gospel, but not without recognizing in it a true apostolic foundation. The Apostle John, with the design of fixing the image of his Master, which, in proportion as the reality was farther removed from him, came to be more and more indefinite in his mind, and in order to give himself a distinct account of the impression which he had preserved of the person of Jesus, had drawn up certain "studies" which, when amplified, became the discourses of the fourth Gospel. To these more or less authentic parts, a historical framework which was completely fictitious was afterwards adapted. We can understand how, from this point of view, Weisse was able to defend the authenticity of the first Epistle of John.

At this juncture there occurred in the criticism of the fourth Gospel a revolution like to that which was wrought at the same time in the mode of looking at the first three. *Wilke* then endeavored to prove that the differences which distinguish the Synoptical narratives from one another were not, as had been always believed, simple involuntary accidents, but that it was necessary to recognize in them modifications introduced by each author, in a deliberate and intentional way, into the narrative of his predecessor or predecessors.[2] *Bruno Bauer* extended this mode of explaining the matter to the fourth Gospel.[3] He claimed that the Johannean narrative was not by any means, as the treatise of Strauss supposed, the depository of a simple legendary tradition, but that this story was the product of an individual conception, the reflective work of a Christian thinker and poet, who was perfectly conscious of his procedure. The history of Jesus was thus reduced, according to Ebrard's witty expression, to a single line: "At that time it came to pass . . . that nothing came to pass."

In the same year, *Lützelberger* attacked, in a more thoroughly searching way than Reuterdahl, the tradition as to the residence of John in Asia

[1] *Die evangelische Geschichte kritisch und philosophisch bearbeitet*, 1838. *Die Evangelien-Frage*, 1856.

[2] *Der Urevangelist*, 1838.

[3] *Kritik der evangel. Geschichte des Johannes*, 1840.

Minor.[1] The author of our Gospel was, in his view, a Samaritan, whose parents had emigrated to Mesopotamia, between 130 and 135, at the epoch of the new revolt of the Jews against the Romans, and he composed this Gospel at Edessa. The "disciple whom Jesus loved" was not John, but Andrew.—In a celebrated article, *Fischer* tried to prove, from the use of the term οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι in our Gospel, that its author could not be of Jewish origin.[2]

We arrive here at the third and last period of this prolonged conflict. It dates from 1844 and has as its starting-point the famous work published at that time by *Ferdinand Christian Baur*.[3] The first phase had lasted twenty and odd years, from Evanson to Bretschneider (1792–1820); the second, also twenty and odd years, from Bretschneider to Baur; the third has now continued more than thirty years. It is that of mortal combat. The dissertation which was the signal of it is certainly one of the most ingenious and brilliant compositions which theological science has ever produced. The purely negative results of Strauss' criticism demanded as a complement a positive construction; on the other hand, the arbitrary and subjective character of that of Bruno Bauer did not answer the wants of an era eager for positive facts. The discussion was, therefore, as it were, involved in inextricable difficulties.

Baur understood that his task was to withdraw it from that position, and that the only efficacious means was to discover in the progress of the Church of the second century a distinctly marked historical situation, which might be, as it were, the ground whereon was raised the imposing edifice of the fourth Gospel. He believed that he had discovered the situation which he sought in the last third of the second century. Then, indeed, *Gnosis* was flourishing, the borders of which the narrative of our Gospel touches throughout all its contents. At that time thinkers were pre-occupied with the idea of the *Logos*, which is precisely the theme of our work. The need was felt more and more of uniting in one great and single Catholic Church the two rival parties which, until then, had divided the Church, and which a series of compromises had already gradually brought near together; the fourth Gospel was adapted to serve them as a treaty of peace. An energetic spiritual reaction against the episcopate was rising: Montanism; our Gospel furnished strength to this tendency,

[1] *Die Kirchliche Tradition über den Apostel Johannes und seine Schriften in ihrer Grundlosigkeit nachgewiesen*, 1840.

[2] *Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theol.* II. 1840.

[3] In Zeller's *Theologische Jahrbücher* Hefte 1, 3, 4; reproduced and completed in the later writings of the same author: *Kritische Untersuchungen über die canonischen Evangelien*, 1847; and *Das Christenthum und die christliche Kirche der drei ersten Jahrhunderte*, 1853.

by borrowing from Montanism the truth which it contained. Then, finally, the famous dispute between the churches of Asia Minor and those of the West on the subject of the Paschal rite burst forth. Now, our Gospel modified the chronology of the Passion in just such a way as to decide the minds of men in favor of the occidental rite. Here, then, was the situation fully discovered for the composition of our Gospel. At the same time, Baur, following the footsteps of Bruno Bauer, shows with a marvelous skill the well-considered and systematic unity of this work; he explains its logical progress and practical applications, and thus overthrows at one blow the hypothesis of unreflective myths, on which the work of Strauss rested, and every attempt at selection in our Gospel between certain authentic parts and other unauthentic ones. In accordance with all this, Baur fixes, as the epoch of the composition, about the year 170—at the earliest, 160; for then it was that all the circumstances indicated meet together. Only he has not attempted to designate the "great unknown" to whose pen was due this master-piece of high mystical philosophy and skillful ecclesiastical policy, which has exercised such a decisive influence on the destinies of Christianity.

All the forces of the school co-operated in supporting the work of the master in its various parts. From 1841, *Schwegler* had prepared the way for it by his treatise on Montanism.[1] In his work on the period which followed that of the apostles, the same author assigned to each one of the writings of the New Testament its place in the development of the conflict between the apostolic Judæo-Christianity and Paulinism, and set forth the fourth Gospel as the crowning point of this long elaboration.[2] *Zeller* completed the work of his master by the study of the ecclesiastical testimonies,—a study whose aim was to sweep away from history every trace of the existence of the fourth Gospel before the period indicated by Baur.[3] *Koestlin*, in a celebrated work on *pseudonymous literature* in the primitive Church, endeavored to prove that the pseudepigraphical procedure to which Baur ascribed the composition of four-fifths of the New Testament was in conformity with literary precedents and the ideas of the epoch.[4] *Volkmar* labored to ward off the blows by which the system of his master was unceasingly threatened by reason of the less and less controvertible citations of the fourth Gospel in the writings of the second

[1] *Der Montanismus und die christliche Kirche des IIten Jahrhunderts.*

[2] *Das nachapostolische Zeitalter*, 1846.

[3] *Die äusseren Zeugnisse über das Dasein und den Ursprung des vierten Evangeliums*, in the *Theologische Jahrbücher*, 1845 and 1847.

[4] *Ueber die pseudonymische Litteratur in der ältesten Kirche*, in the *Theol. Jahrbücher*, 1851.

century—in those of Marcion and Justin, for example, and in the *Clementine Homilies*.[1] Finally, *Hilgenfeld* treated, in a more profound way than Baur had done, the dispute concerning the Passover and its relation to the authenticity of our Gospel.[2]

Thus learnedly supported by this Pleiad of distinguished critics, devoted to the common work, although not without marked shades of difference, Baur's opinion might seem, for a moment, to have obtained a complete and decisive triumph.

Nevertheless, in the midst of the school itself a divergence became manifest which, in many respects, was detrimental to the hypothesis so skillfully contrived by the master. Hilgenfeld abandoned the date fixed by Baur, and consequently a part of the advantages of the situation chosen by him. He carried back the composition of the Johannean Gospel thirty or forty years. According to him, this work was connected especially with the appearance of the *Valentinian* heresy, about 140. The author of the Gospel proposed to himself to introduce this Gnostic teaching into the Church in a mitigated form. And as already about 150 "the existence of our Gospel could scarcely be any longer questioned," he put back its date even to the period from 130 to 140.[3]

In 1860, *J. R. Tobler*, discovering, side by side with the ideal character of the narrative, a mass of geographical notices or of narratives truly historical, conceived the idea of ascribing our Gospel to Apollos (according to him, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews) who compiled it about the end of the first century from information obtained from John.[4]

Michel Nicolas advanced, in 1862, the following hypothesis: A Christian of Ephesus related in our Gospel the ministry of Jesus according to the accounts of the Apostle John; and this personage is the one who, in the two small Epistles, designates himself as the *Elder* (*the presbyter*), and the one whom history makes known to us under the name of John the Presbyter.[5]—*D'Eichthal* accepted Hilgenfeld's idea of a relationship between our Gospel and *Gnosis*.[6] The work which *Stap* published in the same year, in his collection of Critical Studies, is only a reproduction, without originality, of all the ideas of the Tübingen school.[7]

[1] Comp., in particular, *Ursprung unserer Evangelien*, 1866.

[2] *Der Passahstreit der alten Kirche*, 1860.

[3] *Das Evangelium und die Briefe Johannis nach ihrem Lehrbegriffe dargestellt*, 1849; *die Evangelien*, 1854; *das Urchristenthum*, 1855.

[4] *Ueber den Ursprung des vierten Evang.*, in the *Zeitschrift für wissensch. Theol.*, 1860.

[5] *Etudes critiques sur la Bible: Nouveau Testament.*

[6] *Les Evangiles*, 1863; t. I., pp. 25 ff., and elsewhere.

[7] *Etudes historiques et critiques sur les origines du christianisme*, 1863.

In 1864 two important books appeared. *Weizsäcker*, in his work on the Gospels,[1] sought to bring out from our Gospel itself the proof of the distinction between the editor of this writing and the Apostle John, who served as a voucher for him. The former wished only to reproduce in a free way the impressions which he had experienced when hearing the apostolic witness describe the life of the Lord.

The second book takes a more decided position: it is that of *Scholten*.[2] The author of the fourth Gospel is a Christian of Gentile origin, initiated in Gnosticism and desirous of rendering that tendency profitable to the Church. He seeks, also, to restrain within just limits the Marcionite antinomianism and the Montanist exaltation. As to the Paschal dispute, the evangelist does not decide in favor of the Western rite, as Baur thinks; he seeks rather to secure the triumph of Pauline spiritualism, which abolishes feast days in the Church altogether. According to these indications, the author wrote about 150. He succeeded in presenting to the world, under the figure of the mysterious personage designated as "the disciple whom Jesus loved," the ideal believer—the truly spiritual Christianity which was capable of becoming the universal religion.—*Réville* has set forth and developed Scholten's point of view in the *Revue des Deux-Mondes*.[3]

Let us also remind the reader here of the work of *Volkmar*[4] (page 19), directed against Tischendorf personally, as much as against his book, *When were our Gospels written?* However deplorable is its tone, this work exhibits with learning and precision the point of view of Baur's school. The author fixes the date of our Gospel between 150 and 160.

In 1867, appeared the *History of Jesus*, by *Keim*.[5] This scholar energetically opposes, in the Introduction, the authenticity of our Gospel. He lays especial stress upon the philosophical character of this writing; then upon the inconsistencies of the narrative with the nature of things, with the data furnished by the writings of St. Paul, and with the Synoptic narratives. But, on the other hand, he proves the traces of its existence as far back as the earliest times of the second century. "The testimonies," he says, "go back as far as to the year 120, so that the composition dates from the beginning of the second century, in the reign of Trajan, between 100 and 117."[6] The author was a Christian of Jewish

[1] *Untersuchungen über die evangelische Geschichte.*

[2] *Das Evangelium nach Johannes* (1864), translated into German, by H. Lang, 1867.

[3] *La question des évangiles*, May, 1866.

[4] *Der Ursprung unserer Evangelien*, 1866.

[5] *Geschichte Jesu von Nazara.*

[6] Vol. I., p. 146.

origin, belonging to the *Diaspora* of Asia Minor, in full sympathy with the Gentiles and thoroughly acquainted with everything relating to Palestine. In a more recent writing, a popular reproduction of his great work, Keim has withdrawn from this early date, stating as the ground of this change reasons which, we may say, have no serious importance. He now, with Hilgenfeld, fixes the composition about the year 130.[1] Of what consequence here is a period of ten years? It would follow from the one of these last mentioned dates as well as from the other, that, twenty or thirty years after the death of John at Ephesus, the fourth Gospel was ascribed to this apostle by the very presbyters of the country where he had spent the closing portion of his life and where he had died. How can we explain the success of a forgery under such circumstances? Keim felt this difficulty and made an effort to remove it. To this end he found no other means except to attach himself to the idea put forth by Reuterdahl and Lützelberger, and to rate the sojourn of John in Asia Minor as a pure fiction. By this course, he goes beyond even the Tübingen school. For Baur and Hilgenfeld did not call in question the truth of that tradition. Their criticism even rests essentially on the reality of John's sojourn in Asia, first, because the Apocalypse, the Johannean composition of which serves them as the point of support for their onset upon that of the Gospel, implies this sojourn, and, then, because the argument which they both draw from the Paschal controversy falls to the ground as soon as the sojourn of the Apostle John in that country is no longer admitted. Now, on the contrary, when the criticism hostile to our Gospel feels itself embarrassed by this sojourn, it rejects it unceremoniously. According to Keim, that tradition is only the result of a half-voluntary misunderstanding of Irenæus, who applied to John the apostle what Polycarp had related in his presence of another personage of the same name. *Scholten* reaches the same result by different means.[2] This error in the tradition is explained, according to him, by the confounding of the author of the Apocalypse, who was not the apostle, but who had taken advantage of his name, with the apostle himself; in this way the sojourn of John in Asia, where the Apocalypse appears to have been composed, was imagined. However this may be, and whatever may be the explanation of the traditional misunderstanding, the discovery of this error "removes," says Keim, "the last point of support for the idea of the composition of the Gospel by the son of Zebedee."[3]

[1] *Geschichte Jesu, nach den Ergebnissen heutiger Wissenschaft, für weitere Kreise*, 3d ed., 1873.

[2] *Der Apostel Johannes in Klein-Asien*, translated into German by Spiegel, 1872.

[3] P. 167.

We see that two of the foundations of Baur's criticism, the authenticity of the Apocalypse and John's sojourn in Asia, are undermined at this hour by the men who have continued his work—this denial appearing to them the only means of making an end of the authenticity of our Gospel.

In 1868, the English writer, *Davidson*, took his position among the opponents of the authenticity.[1] *Holtzmann*, like Keim, sees in our Gospel an ideal composition, but one which is not entirely fictitious. This book dates from the same epoch as the Epistle of Barnabas (the first third of the second century); it can be proved that the Church has given it a favorable reception since the year 150.[2] *Krenkel*, in 1871, defended the sojourn of John in Asia; he ascribes to this apostle the composition of the Apocalypse, but not that of the Gospel.[3]

The anonymous English work, *Supernatural Religion*, which has in a few years reached a very large number of editions, contends against the authenticity with the ordinary arguments.[4]

The year 1875 witnessed the appearance of two works of considerable importance. These are two Introductions to the New Testament—that of *Hilgenfeld*[5] and the third edition of Bleek's work, published with original notes by *Mangold*.[6] Hilgenfeld gives a summary, in his book, of the whole critical work of past times and of the present epoch. With regard to John, he continues in certain respects to defend the cause to which he had consecrated the first fruits of his pen:—the non-authenticity of the fourth Gospel, which was composed, according to him under the influence of the Valentinian Gnosticism. Mangold accompanies the paragraphs in which Bleek defends the apostolic origin of our Gospel with very instructive critical notes, in which in most cases he seeks to refute that scholar. The external proofs would seem to him sufficient to confirm the authenticity. But it has not been possible, in his opinion, at least up to the present time, to surmount the internal difficulties.

In 1876, a jurist, *d'Uechtritz*, published a book[7] in which he ascribes our Gospel to a Jerusalemite disciple of Jesus—probably John the Presbyter—who assumed the mask of the disciple whom Jesus loved and composed this work under his name. This critic does not find the opinion justified,

[1] *Introduction to the Study of the N. T.* Vol. II.

[2] *Schenkel's Bibellexicon*; Vol. II., art. *Ev. nach Joh.*, 1869.

[3] *Der Apostel Johannes*, 1871.

[4] *Supernatural Religion*, 1874.

[5] *Historisch-Kritische Einleitung in das N. T.*

[6] *Einleitung in das N. T.*, von Fr. Bleek, 3 Aufl., von W. Mangold.

[7] *Studien eines Laien über den Ursprung, die Beschaffenheit und die Bedeutung des Evang. nach Johannes.*

which is so widely spread, that the representation of Jesus traced in the Synoptics is less exalted than the idea which is given us of Him in St. John.

Four writers remain to be mentioned here—three French and one German, who, in our preceding edition, figured in the list of the defenders of the absolute or partial authenticity, and who have passed over into the opposite camp, *Renan*, *Reuss*, *Sabatier* and *Hase*.

The first from the outset manifested a marked antipathy to the discourses ascribed to Jesus by the fourth Gospel. Nevertheless, he always set forth prominently the remarkable signs of authenticity connected with the narrative parts of this same writing. He showed himself disposed, accordingly, in the first editions of his *Life of Jesus*, to recognize as the foundation of the historical parts not only traditions proceeding from the Apostle John, but even "precise notes drawn up by him." In the truly admirable dissertation which closes the thirteenth edition, and in which he thoroughly discusses the question, analyzing the Gospel—one narrative after another—from this point of view, he shows that the contradictory appearances almost exactly balance each other, and ends by positively affirming nothing but this alternative: either the author is John or he has desired to pass himself off as John. Finally, in his last book, entitled *l'Eglise chrétienne*,[1] he arrives at the result which might have been foreseen. The author was perhaps a Christian depositary of the traditions of the apostle, or, at least, of those of two other disciples of Jesus, John the Presbyter and Aristion, who lived at Ephesus about the end of the first century. We might even go so far, according to Renan, as to suppose that this writer is no other than Cerinthus, the adversary of John at Ephesus, at the same period.

Reuss and Sabatier have likewise just finished their evolution in the same direction. In all his previous works,[2] Reuss had maintained two scarcely reconcilable theses: the almost completely artificial and fictitious character of the discourses of Jesus in our Gospel and the apostolic origin of the work. It was not difficult to foresee two things: 1. That one of these theses would end in excluding the other; 2. That it would be the first which would prevail over the second. This is what has just happened. In his *Théologie Johannique*,[3] Reuss declares his final judgment on

[1] 1879.

[2] *Ideen zur Einleitung in das Ev. Joh.* (Denkschr. der theol. Gesellsch. zu Strasb.), 1840; *Geschichte der N. Tchen Schriften*, 1842; *Histoire de la théologie chrétienne au siècle apostolique*, 1852.

[3] *La Bible: Nouveau Testament*, VI^e^ partie, 1879.

this subject: The fourth Gospel is not by the Apostle John. Nevertheless, Reuss is reluctant to allow that this work is by a forger. And it is not necessary to admit this, since the author expressly distinguishes himself from the Apostle John in more than one passage, and limits himself to tracing back to him the origin of the narratives contained in his book. We thus find again, point for point, the opinion of Weizsäcker mentioned above.

Sabatier, in his excellent little work on the sources of the life of Jesus,[1] had also maintained the authenticity of our Gospel. But, having once entered into the views of Reuss, with respect to the estimation of the discourses of Jesus, he was by a fatality obliged to follow him even to the end. He has just distinctly declared himself against the authenticity, in his article on the Apostle John, in the *Encyclopédie des sciences religieuses :*[2] An author whose constant inclination is to exalt the Apostle John cannot be John himself. It is one of his disciples who, believing that he was able to identify himself with him, has drawn up the Gospel history in the form which it had assumed in Asia Minor; he thus gives to the Church the *apocalypse of the Spirit*, a counterpart of the Apocalypse, properly so called, written by the apostle.

Since 1829, in the different editions of his Manual on the Life of Jesus,[3] Hase had supported the Johannean origin of the fourth Gospel. In 1866, he published a discourse in which he represented this work as the last product of the apostle's mind when it had reached its full maturity.[4] But this scholar has yielded to the same fatal law as the three preceding writers. In his History of Jesus,[5] published in 1876, he gives up the authenticity, though not without painful hesitation. "Let us cast a glance," he says in closing the discussion, "at the eight reasons alleged against the Johannean origin: they have not proved to be decisive;[6] nevertheless, it has not been possible to refute them all completely. . . . I thus see science driven to a conception fitted to reconcile the opposite reasons. A tradition different from that of the other Gospels, and already containing the notion of the Logos, had taken form in Asia Minor under the influence of the accounts given by John. It had remained in the purely oral state, so long as John lived." After his death (ten years afterwards, or perhaps more), this tradition was recorded by a highly gifted

[1] *Essai sur les sources de la vie de Jésus*, 1866.

[2] Vol. vii., 1879, pp. 181–193.

[3] *Das Leben Jesu.* Ein Lehrbuch für Academische Vorlesungen; 5th ed., 1865.

[4] *Das Evangelium des Johannes.* Eine Rede an die Gemeinde.

[5] *Geschichte Jesu.*

[6] "Sie haben sich nicht als entscheidend erwiesen."

disciple of the apostle. He wrote as if the latter himself were writing. In this way it is, that the evangelist is able to appeal at once to the testimony of his own eyes (i. 14) and to that of another, different from himself. "Who was the writer? The Presbyter John? This is possible. But it may be also an unknown person. The first Epistle may have proceeded from the same author, writing under the mask of John; but it may also have been from John himself and have served as a model for the style of the Gospel." This hypothesis is, according to this author, a compromise between the facts which are contradictory to each other. "I have not without a heavy heart," he adds, "broken away from the belief in the entire authenticity of the Johannean writing." Finally, a little further on, he also says: "The time is come in German theology when he who even ventures to recognize in the fourth Gospel a source possessing an historical value compromises his scientific honor.[1] It has not always been thus, even among those who are lacking neither in vigor nor in freedom of mind. But it may also change again:[2] the spirit of the times exercises a power even in science." What reflections do not these sad avowals of the veteran of Jena suggest!

II.

This persevering contest against the authenticity of the Johannean Gospel resembles the siege of a fortress, and things have reached the point where already many think they see the standard of the besieger floating victoriously over the ramparts of the place. Nevertheless, the defenders have not remained inactive, and the incessant transformations which the onsets have undergone, as the preceding exposition proves, leave no room for questioning the relative success of their efforts. Let us rapidly enumerate the works devoted to the defence of the authenticity.

The oldest attack, that of the sectaries of the second century, called *Alogi*, did not remain unanswered; for it seems certain that the writing of Hippolytus (at the beginning of the third century), whose title appears in the catalogue of his works[3] as Ὑπὲρ τοῦ κατὰ Ἰωάννου εὐαγγελίου καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως, "*In behalf of the Gospel of John and the Apocalypse*," was directed against them.

The attacks of the English deists were repulsed in Germany and Hol-

[1] The author here quotes an expression of Keim.

[2] "Es kann aber auch anders kommen. . . ." (p. 52).

[3] Catalogue engraved on the pedestal of his statue, discovered at Rome in 1561.

land by *Le Clerc*[1] and *Lampe;* by the latter, in his celebrated Commentary on the Gospel of John.[2]

Two Englishmen, *Priestley*[3] and *Simpson,*[4] immediately answered Evanson. *Storr* and *Süskind* resolved the objections raised soon afterwards in Germany,[5] and this with such success that Eckermann and Schmidt declared that they retracted their doubts.

Following upon this first phase of the struggle, *Eichhorn* (1810), *Hug* (1808), and *Bertholdt* (1813), in their well-known Introductions to the New Testament, *Wegscheider* in a special work,[6] and others also, unanimously declared themselves on the side of the authenticity; so that at the beginning of this century the storm seemed to be calmed and the question settled in favor of the traditional opinion. The historian *Gieseler,* in his admirable little work on the origin of the gospels (1818), pronounced his decision in the same way, and expressed the idea that John had composed his book for the instruction of Gentiles who had already made progress in the Christian religion.[7]

The work of Bretschneider, which all at once broke this apparent calm, called forth a multitude of replies, among which we shall cite only those of *Olshausen,*[8] *Crome,*[9] and *Hauff.*[10] The first editions of the Commentaries of *Lücke* (1820) and *Tholuck* (1827) appeared also at this same period.

In consequence of the first of these publications, Bretschneider, as we have already said, declared his objections solved; so that once more the calm appeared to be restored, and *Schleiermacher,* with all his school, could yield himself, without encountering any opposition worthy of notice, to the predilection which he felt for our Gospel. From the beginning of his scientific career, Schleiermacher, in his *Reden über die Religion,* proclaimed the Christ of John to be the true historic Christ, and maintained that the Synoptic narrative must be subordinated to our Gospel. Critics as learned and independent as *Schott* and *Credner* likewise maintained at that time the cause of the authenticity[11] in their Introductions. De Wette alone at that moment caused a somewhat discordant voice to be still heard.

[1] *Annotationes ad Hammond.* Nov. Test., 1714.

[2] *Commentarius in Evang. Johannis,* 1727.

[3] *Letters to a young man,* 1793.

[4] *An essay on the authority of the New Testament,* 1793.

[5] In Flatt's Magazine, 1798, No. 4, and 1800, No. 6.

[6] *Versuch einer vollständigen Einleit. in das Evang. des Johannes,* 1806.

[7] *Historisch-Krit. Versuch über die Entstehung und die frühesten Schicksale der schriftlichen Evangelien.*

[8] *Die Echtheit der vier canonischen Evangelien,* 1823.

[9] *Probabilia hand probabilia,* 1824.

[10] *Die Authentie und der hohe Werth des Evang. Johannes,* 1831.

[11] That of Schott in 1830; that of Credner in 1836.

The appearance of Strauss' *Life of Jesus*, in 1835, was thus like a thunderbolt bursting forth in a serene sky. This work called forth a whole legion of apologetic writings; above all, that of *Tholuck* on the credibility of the evangelical history,[1] and the *Life of Jesus* by *Neander*.[2] The concessions made to Strauss by the latter have been often wrongly interpreted. They had as their aim only to establish a minimum of incontrovertible facts, while giving up that which might be assailed. And it was this work which is so moderate, so impartial, and in whose every word we feel the incorruptible love of truth, which seems, for the moment, to have made upon Strauss the deepest impression, and to have drawn from him, with reference to the Gospel of John, the kind of retractation announced in his third edition.[3]

Gfroerer,[4] although starting from quite another point of view as compared with the two preceding writers, defended the authenticity of our Gospel against Strauss. *Frommann*,[5] on his side, refuted the hypothesis of Weisse. From 1837 to 1844, *Norton* published his great work on the evidences of the authenticity of the Gospels,[6] and *Guericke*, in 1843, his Introduction to the New Testament.[7]

In the following years appeared the work of *Ebrard* on the evangelical history,[8] the truth of which he valiantly defended against Strauss and Bruno Bauer, and the third edition of *Lücke's* Commentary (1848). But this last author made such concessions as to the credibility of the discourses and of the Christological teaching of John, that the adversaries did not fail soon to turn his work against the very thesis which he had desired to defend.

We reach the last period,—that of the struggle maintained against Baur and his school. *Ebrard* was the first to appear in the breach.[9] At his side a young scholar presented himself, who, in a work filled with rare patristic erudition and knowledge drawn from the primary sources, sought to bring back to the right path historical criticism, which, in the hands of Baur, seemed to have strayed from it. We mean *Thiersch*, whose work, modestly entitled an *Essay*, is still at the present day for beginners one of the most useful means of orientation in the domain of the history of the first two

[1] *Die Glaubwürdigkeit der evangel. Geschichte*, 1837.

[2] *Das Leben Jesu Christi*, 1837.

[3] Edition of 1840.

[4] *Geschichte des Urchristenthums*, 1838.

[5] *Ueber die Echtheit und Integrität des Evang. Joh.*, 1840.

[6] *The Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels.*

[7] *Historisch-Kritische Einleitung in das N. T.*

[8] *Wissenschaftliche Kritik der Evangel. Geschichte*, 1st ed., 1842; 3d ed., 1868.

[9] *Das Evang. Joh. und die neueste Hypothese über seine Entstehung*, 1845.

centuries.[1] Baur did not brook this call to order which was addressed to him—to him, a veteran in science—by so young a writer. In an excitement of irritation, he wrote that violent pamphlet in which he accused his adversary of fanaticism, and which had almost the character of a denunciation.[2] The reply of Thiersch was as remarkable for its propriety and dignity of tone as for the excellence of the general observations which are presented in it on the criticism of the sacred writings.[3] The justness of some of Thiersch's ideas may be called in question, but it cannot be denied that his two works abound in ingenious and original points of view.

A strange work appeared at this time. The author is commonly quoted in German criticism under the name of *the Anonymous Saxon;* it is now known that he was a Saxon theologian, named *Hasert*, who was, at that time, one of the Thurgovian clergy. He defended the authenticity of our Gospels, but with the intention of showing, by this very authenticity, how the apostles of Jesus, the authors of these books, or rather of these pamphlets, had labored only to decry and traduce one another.[4]

The most able and most learned reply to the works of Baur and Zeller was that of *Bleek*, in 1846.[5] By the side of this work, the articles by *Hauff* deserve to be specially mentioned.[6]

In the following years, *Weitzel* and *Steitz*, discussed with much care and erudition the argument drawn by Baur from the Paschal controversy, near the end of the second century.[7] Following in the footsteps of *Bindemann* (1842), *Semisch* demonstrated the use of our four Gospels by Justin Martyr.[8]

The year 1852, saw the appearance of two very interesting works: that of the Dutch writer, *Niermeyer*, designed to prove by a subtle and thorough study of the writings ascribed to John, that the Apocalypse and the Gospel could and must have, both of them, been composed by him, and that the differences of contents and form, which distinguish them, are to be explained by the profound spiritual revolution which was wrought in

[1] *Versuch zur Herstellung des historischen Standpuncts für die Kritik der neutest. Schriften*, 1845.

[2] *Der Kritiker und der Fanatiker in der Person des Herrn H. W. J. Thiersch*, 1846.

[3] *Einige Worte über die Echtheit der neutest. Schriften, zur Erwiderung*, etc., 1847.

[4] *Die Evangelien, ihr Geist, ihre Verfasser, und ihr Verhältniss zu einander*, 1845.

[5] *Beiträge zur Evangelienkritik.*

[6] *Einige Bemerkungen über die Composition des Johann. Evangeliums*, in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1846.

[7] Weitzel, *Die christliche Passahfeier der drei ersten Jahrhunderte*, 1848; Steitz in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1856 and 1857.

[8] *Die apostolischen Denkwürdigkeiten des Märtyrers Justin*, 1848.

the apostle after the destruction of Jerusalem.[1] A similar idea was expressed, at the same time, by *Hase*.[2] The second work is the Commentary of *Luthardt* on the fourth Gospel, the first part of which contains a series of characteristic portraitures of the principal actors in the evangelical drama, according to St. John, designed to render palpable the living reality of all these personages. These portraitures are full of acute and just observations.

Ewald, like Hase, defends the authenticity, but does so, while according scarcely any historical credibility to the discourses which the apostle assigns to Jesus, and even to the miraculous deeds which he relates.[3] This is an inconsistency which Baur has severely criticised in his reply to Hase. Such defences of a gospel are almost equivalent to sentences of condemnation pronounced against it, or rather they destroy themselves. We can say almost the same of the opinion of *Bunsen*,[4] who regards the Gospel of John as the only monument of the evangelical history proceeding from an eye-witness, who declares even that otherwise "there is no longer an historical Christ," and who yet remits to the domain of legend so decisive a fact as that of the resurrection. *Bleek*, in his Introduction to the New Testament,[5] and *Meyer*, *Hengstenberg*, and *Lange*, in their Commentaries, have declared themselves in favor of the authenticity, as well as *Astié*[6] (who adopts Niermeyer's point of view), and the author of these lines.[7] The Johannean question, in its relation to that of the Synoptic Gospels, has been treated in an instructive way by *de Pressensé*.[8]

The study of the patristic testimonies has recently been made the object of two works, one of a popular character, and the other more exclusively scientific: the little treatise of *Tischendorf* on the time of the composition of our Gospels,[9] and the Academic programme of *Riggenbach*

[1] *Over die echtheid der Johanneischen Schriften*, etc., 1852. See the reviews of this work in the *Revue de théologie*, June, July and Sept., 1856. See also the articles *Jean le prophète* and *Jean l' evangéliste*, ou la crise *de la foi chez un apôtre*, by M. Réville (*Rev. de théol.*, 1854).

[2] *Die Tübinger-Schule.* Sendschreiben an Baur, 1855. *Vom Evangelium des Johannes*, 1866.

[3] *Jahrbücher der biblischen Wissenschaft*, 1851, 1853, 1860, 1865. *Die Johann. Schriften*, 1861.

[4] In his *Bibelwerk.*

[5] The chapters of Bleek relating to the Gospel of John have been translated into French by Bruston, under the title: *Etude critique sur l' évangile de Jean*, 1864. Translation of Bleek's Introduction into English, in Clark's For. Theol. Libr., 1869.

[6] *Explication de l'évangile selon saint Jean*, 1863.

[7] *Commentaire sur l' évangile de St. Jean*, 1864; translated into German by Wunderlich, 1869; the conclusion, since 1866, by Wirz, under the title: *Prüfung der Streitfragen über das 4te Evang.*—2d ed., 1876.

[8] In the first book of his *Vie de Jésus.*

[9] *Wann wurden unsere Evangelien verfasst?* 1865; 4th ed., 1866.

in 1866, on the historical and literary testimonies in favor of the Gospel of John.[1] The solidity and impartiality of this latter work have been recognized by the author's opponents.

We may add to these two writings that in which the Groningen professor, *Hofstede de Groot*, has treated the question of the date of Basilides and of the Johannean quotations, especially in the Gnostic writers.[2] The cause of the authenticity has also been maintained by the Abbé *Déramey* (1868).[3]

The tradition of the sojourn of John in Asia Minor has been valiantly defended against Keim by *Steitz*[4] and *Wabnitz*.[5] *Wittichen*, taking his position at a point of view which is peculiar to himself, gives up the sojourn of the Apostle John in Asia, but does this in order so much the better to support the authenticity of our Gospel, while he maintains that it was composed by the apostle in Syria for the purpose of combating the Ebionites who were of Essenic tendency. This work would thus date from the times which immediately followed the destruction of Jerusalem. As for the John of Asia Minor, he was the presbyter, the author of the Apocalypse.[6] We have here the antipode of the Tübingen theses.

In two works, one by *Zahn*, the other by *Riggenbach*, the question of the existence of John the Presbyter, as a distinct personage from the apostle, has been treated. After a careful study of the famous passage of Papias relative to this question, they come to a negative conclusion.[7] *Leimbach* likewise, in a special study,[8] does the same thing, and Professor *Milligan*, of Aberdeen, also, in an article in the *Journal of Sacred Literature*, entitled *John the Presbyter* (Oct. 1867).

The historical credibility of the discourses of Jesus in the fourth Gospel has been defended against modern objections by *Gess*, in the first volume of the second edition of his work on the Person of our Lord,[9] and more especially by *H. Meyer* in a very remarkable licentiate-thesis.[10] The English

[1] *Die Zeugnisse für das Evang. Johannis neu untersucht.*

[2] *Basilides am Ausgang des apostolischen Zeitalters*; German edition, 1868.

[3] *Défense du quatrième évangile.*

[4] *Studien und Kritiken*, 1869.

[5] In the *Bulletin théologique*, 1868.

[6] *Der geschichtliche Charakter des Evang. Joh.*, 1868.

[7] Zahn: *Papias von Hierapolis*, in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1866, No. 2; Riggenbach: *Johannes der Apostel und Presbyter*, in the *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*, 1868.

[8] *Das Papias-Fragment*, 1875 (reply to the work: *Das Papias-Fragment des Eusebius*, by Weiffenbach, 1874.)

[9] *Christi Person und Werk.* Neue Bearbeitung. Part I. *Christi Zeugniss*, etc., 1870.

[10] *Les Discours du 4e év. sont-ils des discours historiques de Jésus?* 1872.

work of *Sanday*[1] dates from the year 1872, and that of the superintendent *Leuschner*[2]—a brave little work which especially attacks Keim and Scholten.

We close this review by mentioning six recent and remarkable works, all of them devoted to the defense of the authenticity. Three are the products of German learning. The first is the critical study of *Luthardt*,[3] forming in a special volume the introduction to the second edition of his Commentary on the fourth Gospel. The second is the brilliant work of *Beyschlag* in the *Studien und Kritiken*,[4] which contains perhaps the most able replies to the modern objections. *Bernhard Weiss* (in the sixth edition of Meyer's Commentary) has treated, in a manner at once profound and concise, the question of the origin of our Gospel. He vigorously defends the authenticity, without, however, maintaining strictly the historical character of the discourses.[5]

The French work is that of *Nyegaard*.[6] It is a thesis devoted to the examination of the external testimonies relating to the authenticity. This same subject is specially treated by one of the two English works, that of *Ezra Abbott*, professor in Harvard University.[7] This work seems to me to exhaust the subject. A complete acquaintance with modern discussions, profound study of the testimonies of the second century, moderation and perspicuity in judgment—nothing is wanting. The other English work is the Commentary of *Westcott*, professor at Cambridge.[8] In the introduction all the critical questions are handled with learning and tact.

III.

Pressed by the force of the reasons alleged for and against the authenticity, a certain number of theologians have sought to give satisfaction to both sides by having recourse to a middle position.

Some have attempted to make a selection between the truly Johannean parts and those which have been added later. Thus *Weisse*, to whom we have been obliged to attribute an important part in the history of the struggle against the authenticity (page 19), would be disposed, neverthe-

[1] *The authorship and historical character of the fourth Gospel.*

[2] *Das. Evang. Joh. und seine neuesten Widersacher.*

[3] *Der Johann. Ursprung des vierten Evang.*, 1874.

[4] 1874 and 1875.

[5] *Kritisch-exeget. Handbuch über das Evang. des Johann.*, 6th ed., 1880.

[6] *Essai sur les critères externes de l'authenticité du quatrième évangile*, 1876.

[7] *The authorship of the fourth Gospel.—External evidences*, Boston, 1880.

[8] *The Holy Bible*, commented upon by a company of English bishops and clergymen; N. T., vol. II., 1880.

less, to ascribe to John himself chap. i., 1–5 and 9–14, certain passages in chap. iii., and, finally, the discourses contained in chaps. xiv.–xvii. (while striking out the dialogue portions and narrative elements).

Schweizer has proposed another mode of selection.[1] The narratives which have Galilee as their theatre must, according to him, be eliminated from the Johannean writing; they have been added later to facilitate the agreement between the narrative of John and that of the Synoptics. Is not chap. xxi. for example, a manifest addition? *Schenkel* had formerly proposed to regard the discourses as forming the primitive work, and the historical parts as added subsequently.[2] But since the unity of the composition of our Gospel has been triumphantly demonstrated, the division in such an external way has been given up. We are not acquainted with any more recent attempts of this kind.

This long enumeration, which contains only the most noteworthy works, proves of itself the gravity of the question.[3] Let us sum up the preceding exposition. We may do this by making the following scale, which includes all the points of view which have been mentioned.

1. Some deny all participation, even moral and indirect, on the part of the Apostle John in the composition of the work which bears his name.

[1] *Das Evang. Joh. nach seinem inneren Werth kritisch untersucht*, 1841. The author has since then withdrawn his hypothesis.

[2] *Studien und Kritiken*, 1840 (review of the work of Weisse). In his later works he makes of the Gospel an ideal composition, dating from 110 to 120.

[3] Let us mention also various Review articles which are not without importance. First, three remarkable articles of Weizsäcker in the *Jahrb. für deutsche Theologie: Das Selbstzeugniss des Johann. Christus* (1857); *Beiträge zur Charakteristik des Joh. Ev.* (1859); *die Joh. Logoslehre* (1862). Then, four studies of Holtzmann in the *Zeitschrift für wissensch. Theol.: Barnabas und Johannes* 1871, in which the author proves that the epistle of Barnabas rests upon Matthew, but not upon John; *Hermas und Johannes* (1875), in which he seeks to prove, in opposition to Zahn, that Hermas does not depend on John, but John is posterior to Hermas; the *Shepherd* is an essay of a novice which the fourth Gospel has, at a later time, perfected (Harnack, in 1876, refuted Holtzmann in the same journal, but without accepting Zahn's thesis); *Johannes, Ignatius und Polycarp* (1877), in which he reduces to nothing the testimonies borrowed from the last two in favor of the Gospel of John; *Papias und Johannes* (1880), in which he seeks to show that the order of the apostles' names in the famous list of authorities in Papias does not rest, as Steitz has proved, upon the Gospel of John. The two works of Van Goens: *L'apôtre Jean est-il l'auteur du IVe évangile?* and of Rambert, in reply to the foregoing, in the *Revue de théologie et de philosophie*, Lausaune, 1876 and 1877.—The study of Weiffenbach on the testimony of Papias (p. 37) and the reply of Ludemann ("Zur Erklärung des Papiasfragments") in the *Jahrb. für protest. Theol.*, 1879. This last work closes with a general survey of the whole Johannean literature.—Finally, a critical article of Hilgenfeld on Luthardt's Introduction to the fourth Gospel and on my own, in the *Jahrb. für wissensch. Theol.*, 1880.

With the exception of certain elements borrowed from the Synoptics, this work contains only a fictitious history (Baur, Keim).

2. Others make our Gospel a free redaction of the Johannean traditions, which continued in Asia Minor after the sojourn of the apostle at Ephesus; the author thought that he could innocently pass himself off as the Apostle John himself (Renan, Hase).

3. A third party do not admit that the author wished to pass himself off as John; they think, on the contrary, that he has expressly distinguished himself from the apostle, whose stories served him as authorities (Weizsäcker, Reuss).

4. The partisans of a middle course go a little further. They discover in the Gospel a certain number of passages or notes which are due to the pen of John himself and which were amplified at a later time (Weisse, Schweizer).

5. Finally, there come the defenders of the authenticity properly so called, who are yet divided on one point; some recognize in the text as it exists more or less considerable interpolations (the incident of the angel at Bethesda, chap. v.; the story of the woman taken in adultery, chap. viii.), and the important addition of chap. xxi.; others adopt as authentic the common text in its entirety.

On which of the steps of this scale must we place ourselves in order to be with the truth? This is what the scrupulous examination of the facts alone can teach us.

BOOK FIRST.

THE APOSTLE ST. JOHN.

I.

JOHN IN HIS FATHER'S HOUSE.

It appears from all the documents that John was a native of Galilee. He belonged to that northern population, with whose lively, laborious, independent, warlike character Josephus has made us acquainted. The pressure exerted on the nation by the religious authorities having their seat at Jerusalem did not bear with equal weight upon that remote country. More free from prejudice, more open to the immediate impression of the truth, Galilean hearts offered to Jesus that receptive soil which His work demanded. Thus all His apostles, with the exception of Judas Iscariot, seem to have been of that province, and it was there that He succeeded in laying the foundations of His Church.

John dwelt on those shores of the lake of Gennesaret, which, in our day, present to the eye only a vast solitude, but which were then covered with towns and villages having in all, according to Josephus, many thousands of inhabitants. Did John, as is often said, have his home at Bethsaida? This is the conclusion drawn from Luke v. 10, where he is designated, along with his brother James, as a *partner* of Simon, and from John i. 44, where Bethsaida is called *the city of Andrew and Peter*. But, notwithstanding this, John may have dwelt at Capernaum, which could not have been far removed from the hamlet of Bethsaida, since on coming out of the synagogue of that city Jesus enters immediately into Peter's house (Mark i. 29).

The family of John contained four persons who are known to us: his brother James, who seems to have been his elder brother, since he is ordinarily named before him; their father Zebedee, who was a fisherman (Mark i. 19, 20), and their mother, who must have borne the name of Salome, for in the two evidently parallel passages, Matt. xxvii. 56, and Mark xv. 40, where the women are mentioned who were present at the crucifixion of Jesus, the name *Salome* in Mark is the equivalent of the title: *the mother of the sons of Zebedee* in Matthew. Wieseler has sought to prove that Salome was the sister of Mary, the mother of Jesus; from which it would follow that John was the cousin-german of our Lord.[1] We cannot regard this hypothesis as having sufficient foundation, either

[1] *Studien und Kritiken*, 1840.

exegetically or historically. The enumeration in John xix. 25, in which Wieseler finds four persons: 1. The mother of Jesus; 2. The sister of His mother; 3. Mary, the wife of Clopas, and 4. Mary Magdalene, appears to us to include only three, the words *Mary, the wife of Clopas* being quite naturally the explanatory apposition of the words, *the sister of His mother* (see the exegesis). And how is it possible in that case that our Gospels should not present some trace of so near a relationship between Jesus and John? Wieseler asks, it is true, how two sisters could, both of them, have borne the name of Mary. But there is nothing to prevent the word *sister* here from being taken, as it is so frequently, in the sense of *sister-in-law*. This sense is the more probable, inasmuch as, according to a very ancient tradition (Hegesippus), Clopas was the brother of Joseph, and consequently brother-in-law of Mary, the mother of Jesus.

John's family enjoyed a certain competency. According to Mark i. 20, Zebedee has day-laborers; Salome is ranked (Matt. xxvii. 56), in the number of the women who accompanied Jesus as He journeyed, and who (Luke viii. 3) *ministered* to Him and the Twelve *of their substance*. According to our Gospel (xix. 27), John possessed a house of his own, into which he received the mother of our Lord. Is it necessary to reckon, as some have done, among these indications of competency, the relation of his family to the high-priest, of which mention is made in xviii. 16? This conclusion has the less foundation since it cannot be proved that *the other disciple* mentioned in that passage was one of the sons of Zebedee, either John or James. The prosperous condition of the family was undoubtedly due to the then very lucrative business of fishing, and to the considerable commerce which was connected with it.[1]

Two points in the life of Salome betray a lively religious sentiment: the eagerness with which she consecrated herself, as we have just seen, to the service of Jesus, and the request which she had the boldness one day to present to the Lord on behalf of her two sons (Matt. xx. 20). Such a petition reveals an enthusiastic heart, and a piety which was ardent, yet imbued with the most earthly Messianic hopes. She had labored, no doubt, to exalt in the same direction the religious patriotism of her sons. So, as soon as the forerunner appeared on the scene, John hastened to his baptism. He even attached himself to him as his disciple (John i.); and it was in his presence that Jesus met him when he returned from the desert, whither he had betaken Himself after His baptism, with the design of beginning His work.[2]

II.

JOHN A FOLLOWER OF JESUS.

As John passed quietly from the paternal hearth to the baptism of the forerunner, he seems also to have passed without any violent crisis from the school of the latter to that of Jesus. In this progressive development

[1] See *Lücke's Commentary*, Introduction, p. 9.

[2] We refer for the justification of these data to the exegesis of John i.

there was no shock, and no rupture. He had only to follow the inward drawing, the Father's teaching, according to the profound expressions which he himself employs, in order to rise from step to step even to the summit of truth. It was the royal road described in that utterance of the Lord to Nicodemus: "He that doeth the truth cometh to the light, because his works are wrought in God" (John iii. 21). By this calm and continuous character of his development, John appears to be, in the spiritual world, the antipode of Paul.

The story of his call as a believer has been preserved to us in the first chapter of our Gospel; for everything tends to make us believe that the disciple who accompanied Andrew, at that decisive hour in which the new society was founded, was no other than John himself. From the banks of the Jordan, Jesus then returned, with him and the few young Galileans in the company of John the Baptist, whom He had attached to Himself, first to Cana and then to Nazareth, which He left soon afterwards in company with His mother and His brethren, to establish Himself with them at Capernaum (John ii. 12; comp. Matt. iv. 13). Jesus, as Himself still belonging to His family, had sent back these young men to the bosom of their own. But when, a few days afterwards, the moment arrived when He must enter upon His ministry in Judea, in the theocratic capital, He called them to follow Him in a permanent way and severed for them, as for Himself, the ties of domestic life. This new call took place on the shores of the lake of Gennesaret, near Capernaum. The account of it is given in Matt. iv. 18 and the parallel passages.

Subsequently, as the company of His disciples became more and more numerous, He chose twelve from among them, on whom He conferred the special title of *apostles* (Luke vi. 12 ff.; Mark iii. 13 ff.). In the first rank were the two brothers, John and James, with their two friends Simon and Andrew, who were also brothers. And soon among these four the two sons of Zebedee and Simon were honored by a more especial intimacy with Jesus. Thus we see them alone admitted to the raising of Jairus' daughter and to the two scenes of the transfiguration and Gethsemane. John was also, together with Peter, charged with the secret mission of preparing the Passover (Luke xxii. 8). It was, doubtless, this sort of preference of which he, as well as his brother, was the object, which emboldened Salome to ask for them the first places in the Messiah's kingdom.

Must we admit in favor of John a still closer degree of select friendship? Must we see in him that disciple whom Jesus had made His friend in the most peculiar sense of the word, and who, in the fourth Gospel, is several times designated as *the disciple whom Jesus loved* (xiii. 23; xix. 26; xx. 2; xxi. 7, 20 f.)? This was the unanimous opinion of the Church in the age which followed the time of the apostles. Irenæus says: "John, the disciple of the Lord, who rested upon His bosom, also published the gospel while he lived at Ephesus in Asia."[1] Polycrates, the bishop of Ephesus,

[1] Adv. Haer., iii. 1.

says expressly: "John who rested on the bosom of the Lord . . . is buried at Ephesus."[1] John even bore this title: *the disciple who rests on the bosom* of the Master (*μαθητὴς ἐπιστήθιος*).

Lützelberger was the first to call in question this application of the passages quoted to John, and to contend that the disciple loved by Jesus was Andrew, the brother of Peter. But why should this apostle, who, in the first part of the Gospel, is several times designated by his name (i. 41, 45; vi. 8; xii. 22) be, all at once, mentioned in the second part in this anonymous way? Späth has supposed that the beloved disciple was the one who is called Nathanael (John i. 46 ff.); and that this name, which signifies *gift of God*, designates this disciple as the normal Christian, the true gift of God to His Son.[2] But why, in that case, designate him sometimes by the name of Nathanael (i. 46; xxi. 2), and sometimes by this mysterious circumlocution.

Holtzmann likewise identifies the disciple whom Jesus loved with Nathanael, but does so while seeing in this personage only a fictitious being,—the purely ideal type of Paulinism.[3]

Scholten[4] also regards this unnamed disciple as a fictitious personage; he is, in the writer's intention, the symbol of true Christianity, in opposition to the Twelve and their imperfect conception of the gospel.

Is it worth our while to refute such vagaries of the imagination? In chap. xix., the author certainly makes of this disciple a real being, since it is he to whom Jesus entrusts His mother, and who receives her into his house; unless we are ready also to interpret in a symbolic sense this mother who was thus entrusted to him, and to see in her nothing else than the Church itself. This explanation of the sense would surpass in point of arbitrariness the master-pieces of allegorizing of which this passage has sometimes been the occasion among Catholic writers.

In reading the fourth Gospel, we cannot doubt that the disciple whom Jesus loved was, in the first place, one of the Twelve, and then, one of the three who enjoyed especial intimacy with the Saviour. Of these three, he cannot be Peter, for that apostle is named several times *along with* the beloved disciple. No more can he be James, who died too early (about the year 44, Acts xii.) for the report to have been spread abroad in the Church that he would not die (John xxi.). John is, therefore, the only one of the three for whom this title can be suitable. We reach the same result, also, by another way. In John xxi. 2, seven disciples are designated: "Simon Peter, Thomas, called Didymus, Nathanael, of Cana in Galilee, the sons of Zebedee, and two other disciples." Among these seven was the one whom Jesus loved, since he plays a part in the following scene (ver. 20 ff.) Now he cannot be Peter or Thomas or Nathanael, all three of whom are designated by name in the course of the Gospel and in this very passage, nor again one of the two last-mentioned disciples

[1] Eusebius, v. 24 (*ἐν Ἐφέσῳ κεκοίμηται*).

[2] Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1868.

[3] Schenkel's *Bibellexicon*, vol. iv. art. *Nathanael.*

[4] In the brochure: *Der Apostel Johannes in Kleinasien.*

whom the author does not name, doubtless because they did not belong to the number of the Twelve. It only remains, therefore, to choose between the two sons of Zebedee; and between these two, as we have just seen, no hesitation is possible.

In the conduct of John, during the ministry of his Master, two features strike us; a modesty carried even to the extreme of reserve, and a vivacity reaching sometimes even to the point of violence. The fourth Gospel is fond of relating to us the striking sayings of Peter; it speaks of the conversations of Andrew and Philip with Jesus, of the manifestations of devotion or of incredulity in Thomas. In the Synoptics Peter speaks at every moment. But in the one narrative and the other John plays only a very secondary and obscure part. Three sayings only are ascribed to him in our Gospel, and they are all very remarkable for their brevity: "Master, where abidest thou?" (i. 38),—"Lord, who is it?" (xiii. 25),—"It is the Lord!" (xxi. 7).—Moreover, of these three expressions the first was probably uttered by Andrew; and the second came from the mouth of John only at Peter's suggestion. What significance, then, has this fact, which is apparently so little in accord with the altogether peculiar relation of this disciple to Jesus? That John was one of those natures which live more within themselves than without. While Peter occupied the foreground of the scene, John kept himself in the background, observing, contemplating, drinking in love and light, and satisfied with his character of silent personage which so well suited his receptive and profound nature. We can understand the charm which this character must have had for our Lord. He found in this relation, which remained their common secret, that complement which manly natures seek in family ties.

Along with this feature which reveals a character naturally timid and contemplative, we meet certain facts in which John betrays a vivacity of impression capable of rising even to passion; as when, with his brother, he proposes to Jesus to cause fire to descend from heaven on the Samaritan village which has refused to receive Him (Luke ix. 54), or when he is irritated at the sight of a man who, without joining himself to the disciples, takes the liberty of casting out demons in the name of Jesus, and forbids him to continue acting in this way (Luke ix. 49). We may bring into comparison with these two features that request for the first place in the Messianic kingdom, by which we discover the impure alloy which was still mingled with his faith.

How can we explain these two apparently so opposite traits of character? There exist natures which are at once tender, ardent and timid; which ordinarily confine their impressions within themselves, and this the more in proportion as these impressions are the more profound. But if it happens that these persons once cease to be masters of themselves, the long restrained emotions then break forth in sudden explosions which throw all around them into astonishment. Was it not to this order of characters that John and his brother belonged? If it was so, could Jesus better describe them, than by giving them the surname of *Boanerges, sons*

of thunder[1] (Mark iii. 17)? I cannot think, as the Fathers believed, that by this surname Jesus meant to mark the gift of eloquence which distinguished them. No more am I able to admit that He wished to perpetuate thereby the remembrance of their passion in one of the cases indicated (Luke ix. 54). But, as electricity is slowly accumulated in the cloud, until it suddenly breaks forth in the lightning and the thunderbolt, so Jesus observed in these two loving and passionate beings, how the impressions were silently stored within until the moment when, as the result of some outward circumstance, they violently broke forth; and this is what He meant to describe. St. John is often represented as a nature sweet and tender even to effeminacy. Do not his writings before and above all things insist upon love? Were not the last preachings of the old man: "Love one another?" This is true; but we must not forget the traits of a different nature which, both in the earlier and later periods of his life, reveal in him something decided, trenchant, absolute, and even violent?

In thus estimating the character of John we believe ourselves to be in accordance with the truth, rather than Sabatier, where he closes his judgment of the apostle with these words: "It is worthy of remark, that the name of John does not occur in the Synoptics except in connection with censure." But are we to forget that, in one case, he accused himself (Luke ix. 49); that, in another, it was by excess of zeal for the honor of Jesus that he drew upon himself a reprimand (Luke ix. 54); and that, in the third case, the jealous indignation of his fellow-disciples sprung from the same cause as the ambitious petition of the two sons of Salome (Mark x. 41, comp. 42 ff.)? Are we, above all, to forget the place which, according to the Synoptics themselves, Jesus had given to John, as well as to Peter and James, in His most intimate friendship? Comp. also the incident in Luke xxii. 8. The design of this manner of presenting the subject is explained by what follows: "There is here," continues the writer, "a singular contrast to the image of the beloved disciple who leans upon Jesus' bosom, of that ideal disciple who conceals and reveals himself at the same time in the fourth Gospel."[2] It was, then, a stepping-stone to something further! The biography was at the service of the criticism.

If we take account of all the facts which have been pointed out, we shall recognize in John one of those natures passionately devoted to the ideal which, at the first sight, give themselves without reserve to the being who seems to them to realize it. But the devotion of such persons easily takes on somewhat of exclusiveness and intolerance. Everything which does not answer in sympathy completely to their enthusiasm irritates them and excites their indignation. They have no comprehension of what a dividing of the heart is, any more than they know how to have such a divided heart themselves. The whole for the whole! Such is their motto. Where the complete gift is wanting, there is no longer anything to their view. Such affections do not exist without containing an alloy of egoism. A divine work is necessary to the end that the devotion which

[1] Bené régés (בני רגש).

[2] *Encyclopédie des Sciences religieuses*, t. VII., p. 173.

forms their basis may at last come forth purified and may appear in all its sublimity. Such was John—worthy, even in his very faults, of the intimate friendship of the best of men.

III.

JOHN AT THE HEAD OF THE JEWISH-CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

John's part in the Church after the day of Pentecost was that which such antecedents lead us to expect. On that stage where Peter and James, the brother of John, the first martyr among the apostles, and where even mere assistants of the apostles, such as Stephen and Philip, and finally Paul and James, the Lord's brother, moved and acted, John appears only on two occasions:—when he goes up to the temple with Peter (Acts iii.), and when he accompanies this same apostle to Samaria, in order to finish the work begun by Philip (Acts viii.). And on each of these two occasions Peter is the one who plays the principal part; John seems to be only his assistant. As we have already seen, the disciple whom Jesus loved was not a man of action; he did not take the initiative as a conqueror; his mission, like his talent, was of a more inward character. His hour was not to strike until a later time, after the Church was founded. Meanwhile, a deep work, the continuation of that which Jesus had begun in him, was being wrought in his soul. That promise which he has himself preserved for us—"The Spirit shall glorify me in you" was finding its realization in his case. After having given himself up, he found himself again in his glorified Master, and he gave himself up still more fully.

But from this moment he had a particular task to fulfill—that which his dying Master had left as a legacy to him. To Peter, Jesus had entrusted the direction of the Church; to John, the care of His mother.

Where did Mary live? It is scarcely probable that she felt any attraction towards a residence in Jerusalem. Her dearest recollections recalled her to Galilee. Undoubtedly, it was there also, on the shores of the lake of Gennesaret, that John possessed that *home* where he received her and lavished upon her the attentions of filial piety. This circumstance likewise serves to explain why, in those earliest times, he took little part in missionary work. Had he lived at Jerusalem, Paul would undoubtedly have seen him, as well as Peter and James, at the time of his first visit to that city after his conversion (Gal. i. 18, 19).

Later traditions, yet traditions which nothing prevents us from regarding as well-founded, place the death of Mary about the year 48. After that time, John undoubtedly took a more considerable part in the direction of the Christian work. At the time of the assembly, commonly called the council of Jerusalem (Acts xv.), in 50 or 51, he is one of the apostles with whom Paul confers in the capital, and the latter ranks him (Gal. ii.) among those who were regarded as the *pillars* of the Church.[1] An important and much discussed question with respect to John presents itself at this point.

[1] Gal. ii. 9: "James, Cephas and John, who were thought to be pillars.

The Tübingen school ascribes to these three personages, James, Peter and John, who represented the Jewish-Christian Church at that time over against Paul and Barnabas, an opinion opposed to that of these last as to the matter of maintaining legal observances in the Church. The only difference which it recognizes between the apostles and *the false brethren privily brought in*, of whom Paul speaks (Gal. ii. 4),—and it is not to the advantage of the former,—is this: the false brethren, the Pharisaical intruders, held their ground in opposition to Paul and attempted to make him yield, while the apostles, intimidated by his energy and by the eclat of his successes among the Gentiles, abandoned *in fact* their convictions, and agreed, in spite of these men, to divide with him the missionary work. Thus would be reduced to insignificance the import of that sign of co-operation which the apostles gave to Paul and Barnabas, in extending to them the right hand of fellowship at the moment when they separated from each other (ver. 9).

We can readily understand the interest which attaches to this question. If such was really the personal conviction of John, it is obvious that he could not be the author of the fourth Gospel, or that he could be so only on the condition of having previously passed through the crisis of a complete transformation. Schürer himself, who is independent of the Tübingen point of view, says:[1] "The John of the second chapter of Galatians, who disputes with Paul respecting the law, cannot have written our fourth Gospel."

But is it true that the abrogation of the law for the converted Gentiles was a concession which St. Paul was obliged to wrest from the apostles, contrary to their inward conviction? Is it true, in general, that there was on the question of the law a fundamental difference between Paul and the Twelve? This question has been discussed beyond measure during the last thirty years, and I do not think that, on the whole, the scale has turned in the direction of Baur's assertions. I will only take up here one decisive passage—the one which that school most habitually puts forward, and which, to the view of Hilgenfeld, is, as it were, its impregnable fortress. It is Gal. ii. 3, 4: "But Titus who was with me, being a Greek, was not compelled to be circumcised, and that because of (διὰ δέ) the false brethren brought in privily . . ." The following is the way in which Hilgenfeld reasons:—Paul does not say: I did not yield *to* the false brethren; but, I did not yield *because of them*. To whom, then, did he make resistance? Evidently to others than these. These others can only be the apostles. It was the apostles, therefore, who demanded the circumcision of Titus. Consequently they claimed, and John with them, the right to impose circumcision on the Gentiles. The observation from which Hilgenfeld starts is correct; but the conclusion which he draws from it is false. The apostles asked of Paul the circumcision of Titus, and he would not yield to them *because of the false brethren*. Such, indeed, is the fact. But what does it prove? That the false brethren demanded this circumcision in an alto-

[1] *Theol. Liter.-Zeit.*, 1876, No. 14.

gether different spirit from the Twelve. They demanded it as *an obligation*, while the apostles asked it of Paul only as a free concession in favor of the Christians of Jerusalem, who were offended at the thought of intercourse with an uncircumcised person. This is the reason why Paul was able to say: Apart from the false brethren, I might have yielded to the Twelve with *that compliance* (τῇ ὑποταγῇ, ver. 5) which every Christian should exhibit towards his brethren in the things which are in themselves indifferent. And this is what he really did every time that he put himself *under the law* with those who were under the law (1 Cor. ix. 20); comp. the circumcision of Timothy. But it was impossible for him at this time to act thus *because of the false brethren*, who were prepared to make use of that concession in order to turn it to account in relation to the Gentiles as an *obligatory* precedent. The Twelve understood this reason, and did not insist. If the case stands thus, the question is solved. As a matter of right, the Twelve did not impose the law upon the Gentiles. They personally observed it, with the Christians of Jewish origin, but not as a condition of salvation, since, in that case, they could not have exempted the Gentiles from it. They observed it until God, who had imposed this system upon them, should Himself put an end to it. Paul had anticipated them in knowledge on this point only: that to his view the cross was already for the Jews themselves the expected abrogation (Gal. ii. 19, 20). For those of the apostles who, like St. John, survived the fall of the temple, that event must naturally have removed the last doubt in relation to themselves and their nation.

This view does not force us to establish a conflict between the epistles of Paul and the narrative of the Acts. It is likewise in accord with our Synoptic gospels, which are filled with declarations of Jesus containing what involves the abolition of the law. That sentence: "It is not that which entereth into the man which defileth the man, but that which cometh out of *the heart of the man*,"[1] contains in principle the total abolition of the Levitical system. That other saying: "The Son of man is *Lord even of the Sabbath*,"[2] saps the foundation of the Sabbath ordinance in its Mosaic form, and thereby the entire ceremonial institution of which the Sabbath was the centre. By comparing His new economy to a new garment, which must be substituted *as a whole* for the old,[3] Jesus gives expression to a view of the relation between the Gospel and the law beyond which the apostle of the Gentiles himself could not go. And it is the apostles who have transmitted all these words to the Church; and yet they did this, it is said, without at all comprehending their practical application! Independently, then, of the epistles of Paul and the Acts, we are obliged to affirm that what is (wrongly) called Paulinism must have existed, as a more or less latent conviction, in the minds of the apostles from the time of Jesus' ministry. The death of Christ, the day of Pentecost, and the work of Paul could not fail to develop these germs.

Irenæus has very faithfully described this state of things in these words:

[1] Matt. xv. 18–20; Mark vii. 18–20. [2] Mark ii. 28. [3] Matt. ix. 16 and the parallels.

"They themselves (the apostles) persevered in the old observances, conducting themselves piously with regard to the institution of the law; but, as for us Gentiles, they granted us liberty, committing us to the Holy Spirit."[1]

IV.

JOHN IN ASIA MINOR.

After the council of Jerusalem, we lose all trace of John until the time when tradition depicts him as accomplishing his apostolic ministry in the midst of the churches of Asia Minor. It is not probable that he repaired to those remote countries before the destruction of Jerusalem. He undoubtedly accompanied the Jewish-Christian Church when it emigrated to Perea at the time when the war against the Romans broke out. This departure took place about the year 67.[2] Only at a later period, when, in consequence of the death of Paul, and perhaps of the death of his assistants in Asia Minor, Titus and Timothy, the churches of that region, which were so important, found themselves deprived of every apostolic leader, John removed thither. He does not seem to have been the only apostle or apostolic personage who made choice of this place of residence. History speaks of the ministry of Philip, either the apostle or the deacon, at Hierapolis; we find, also, some indications of a sojourn of Andrew in Ephesus.[3] As Thiersch says, "The centre of gravity of the Church was *no longer* at Jerusalem, and it was *not yet* at Rome; it was at Ephesus." Like the circle of golden candlesticks,[4] the numerous and flourishing churches founded by Paul in Ionia and Phrygia were the luminous point towards which the eyes of all Christendom were directed. "From the fall of Jerusalem," says Lücke, "even into the second century, Asia Minor was the most living portion of the Church." What excited an interest on behalf of these churches was not merely the energy of their faith; it was the intensity of the struggle which they had to maintain against heresy. "After my departure," St. Paul had said to the pastors of Ephesus and Miletus (Acts xx. 29, 30), "ravenous wolves shall enter in among you not sparing the flock; and from among your own selves shall men arise speaking perverse things, to draw away the disciples after them." This prophecy was fulfilled. It is not surprising, therefore, that John, one of the last survivors among the apostles, should have gone to supply in those regions the place of the apostle of the Gentiles, and to water, as Apollos had formerly done in Corinth, that which Paul had planted.

The accounts of this residence of John in Asia are numerous and positive. Nevertheless, Keim and Scholten, after the example of Vogel, Reuterdahl, and especially Lützelberger, have in these latter days controverted the truth of this tradition. The former thinks that the personage, named John, whom Polycarp had known, was not the apostle, but the

[1] *Adv. Haer.* iii. 12.

[2] *Ewald, Gesch. des Volks Israel*, vol. vi., p. 642.

[3] So in the so-called Fragment of Muratori.

[4] Apoc. i. 12, 20.

presbyter of the same name, who must have lived at Ephesus about the end of the first century; and that Irenæus erroneously, and even with some willingness, imagined that this master of his own master was the apostle. This was the starting-point of the error which was afterwards so generally disseminated. Scholten believes, rather, that as the Apocalypse was falsely ascribed to the Apostle John, and as the author of that book appeared to have lived in Asia (Apoc. ii., iii.), the residence of the Apostle John in that region was inferred from these false premises.

Let us begin by establishing the tradition; we shall afterwards appreciate the importance of it.

Irenæus says: "All the presbyters who met with John, the disciple of the Lord, in Asia, give testimony that he conveyed to them these things; for he lived with them even to the time of Trajan. And some among them saw not only John, but also other apostles."[1] This whole passage, but especially the last sentence, implies that the person in question is the *apostle*, and not some other John. This is still more precisely set forth in the following words: "Afterwards, John, the disciple of the Lord, *he who leaned on His breast*, published the gospel while he dwelt at Ephesus, in Asia."[2] We read elsewhere: "The church of Ephesus, which was founded by Paul and in which John lived until the time of Trajan, is also a truthful witness of the tradition of the apostles."[3] And further: "Polycarp had not only been taught by the apostles, and lived with several men who had seen Christ, but he had been constituted bishop in the church of Smyrna *by the apostles* who were in Asia; and we ourselves saw him in our early youth, since he lived a very long time and became very aged, and departed this life after a glorious martyrdom, having constantly taught what he had heard from *the apostles*."[4] It cannot be doubted, therefore, that the following words, having reference to the Apocalypse, apply to the apostle: "This number (666) is found in all the accurate and ancient manuscripts, and it is attested by all those *who saw John face to face*."[5]

Thus speaks Irenæus in his principal work. Besides this, we have two letters of his in which he expresses himself in the same way. One of them is addressed to Florinus, his old fellow-pupil under Polycarp, who had embraced the Gnostic doctrines. Irenæus says to him: "These are not the teachings which the elders who preceded us and who lived after the apostles handed down to thee; for I saw thee, when I was still a child, in lower Asia with Polycarp. . . . And I could still show thee the place where he sat when he taught and gave an account of *his relations with John and with the others who saw the Lord*, and how he spoke of what he had heard from them respecting the Lord, His miracles and His doctrine, and how he recounted, in full accord with the Scriptures, all that which he had received from the eye-witnesses of the Word of life."[6] The other letter was addressed

[1] As far as the word *Trajan*, according to the Greek text preserved by Eusebius, H. E., iii. 23. 3; the last words according to the Latin translation: *Adv. Haer.*, ii. 22. 5.

[2] Irenæus, iii. 1. 1, (Eusebius, v. 8. 4).

[3] iii. 3. 4. (Eusebius, iii. 23. 4).

[4] iii. 3. 4. (Eusebius, iv. 14).

[5] v. 30. 1. (Eusebius, v. 8).

[6] Eusebius, v. 20.

by Irenæus to Victor, Bishop of Rome, on occasion of the controversy carried on with regard to the Passover:[1] "When the blessed Polycarp visited Rome in the time of Anicetus, slight differences of opinion having become manifest respecting certain points, peace was very soon concluded. And they did not even give themselves up to a dispute upon the principal question. For Anicetus could not dissuade Polycarp *from observing* [the 14th of Nisan, as the Paschal day], inasmuch as he had always observed it with John, the disciple of the Lord, and *the other apostles* with whom he had lived. And, on his side, Polycarp could not persuade Anicetus *to observe* [the same day], the latter replying that he must maintain the custom which he had received from his predecessors. This being the state of things, they gave each other the communion, and in the assembly Anicetus yielded the office of administering the Eucharist to Polycarp, by way of honor; and they separated in peace." Thus at Rome and in Gaul, no less than in Asia Minor, Polycarp was certainly regarded as the disciple of John *the apostle*, and the arguments of the bishops of Rome were rendered powerless twice in the second century—in 160 (or rather 155) and 190—as they met this fact which was, to the view of all, raised above all controversy.

We find in Asia Minor, about 180, another witness of the same tradition. Apollonius, an anti-Montanist writer, related, at that time, that John had raised a dead man to life at Ephesus. And it is to the apostle, certainly, that he attributed this act. For he is speaking here of the author of the Apocalypse, and we know that, at this period, the churches of Asia had no doubt as to the composition of that book by the apostle.

But, already before Irenæus and Apollonius, Justin has some words relative to John, which imply the idea of his residence in Asia.[2] He says: "A man among us, *one of the apostles of Christ*, has prophesied in the revelation which was given to him (ἐν ἀποκαλύψει γενομένη αὐτῷ)." As the fact of the composition of the Apocalypse in Asia is not doubtful (although Scholten seems desirous of disputing it), it follows from this statement of Justin that he had no doubt that the apostle had resided in Asia. This declaration is the more interesting since it is found in the account of a public discussion which Justin had to maintain at Ephesus itself with a learned Jew. This work[3] dates from 150–160.

We possess, finally, an official document, emanating from the bishops of Asia towards the close of the second century, which attests their unanimous conviction in regard to the matter with which we are engaged. It is the letter which Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, addressed to Victor under the same circumstances which occasioned that of Irenæus quoted above (about 190). He—a man in whose family the office of bishop of that metropolis was, as it were, hereditary (since seven of his relatives had already filled it before him)—writes, with the assent of all the bishops

[1] Euseb., v. 24.

[2] Eusebius, v. 28: "He uses also testimonies derived from the Apocalypse of John, and relates that a dead man had been raised at Ephesus by the same John."

[3] *Against Trypho the Jew.*

of the province who surround him, the following words: "We celebrate the true day. . . . For some great lights are extinguished in Asia and will rise again there at the return of the Lord. . . . Philip, one of the twelve apostles, . . . and John, who reclined on the Lord's bosom, who was high priest and wore the plate of gold, and who was a witness and teacher, and who is buried at Ephesus. . . . All these celebrated the Passover on the fourteenth day, according to the gospel."[1]

Such are the testimonies proceeding from Asia Minor. They are not the only ones. We can add to them one coming from Egypt. Clement of Alexandria, about 190, in the preamble to the story of the young man whom John reclaimed from his errors, writes these words: "After the tyrant was dead, John returned from the island of Patmos to Ephesus, and there he visited the surrounding countries in order to constitute bishops and organize the churches."[2]

We omit the later witnesses (Tertullian, Origen, Jerome, Eusebius), who naturally depend on the older accounts.[3]

By what means is the attempt made to shake so ancient and widely established a tradition?

The Acts of the Apostles, says Keim, do not speak of such a residence of John in Asia. Is it a serious man who speaks thus? With such logic, answers Leuschner, it might also be proved that Paul is not yet dead even to the present hour. As if the book of Acts were a biography of the apostles, and as if it did not end before the time when John lived in Asia!

But the silence of the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians, and of the Pastoral Epistles? adds Scholten. As if the composition of these writings in the second century were a fact so thoroughly demonstrated that it could be made the starting point for new conclusions! Can critical presumption go further?

With more show of probability is the silence of the epistles of Ignatius and Polycarp alleged. Ignatius recalls to the Ephesians, Polycarp to the Philippians, the ministry of Paul in their churches; they are both silent with respect to that of John in Asia. As to Ignatius, these are the terms in which he recalls the Apostle Paul to the Ephesians: "You are *the place of passage* (*πάροδος*) of those who have been taken up to God, the co-initiated with Paul the consecrated one . . . , in whose footsteps may I be found![4]" The question is not of a residence of Paul in Ephesus in general, but quite specially of his last *passage* through Asia Minor, when, as he was repairing to Rome, he gave to the elders of those churches the farewell words reported in the Acts, and, in some sort, associated them with the consecration of his martyrdom. The analogy of

[1] Eusebius v. 24. 3 (comp. iii. 31. 3).

[2] Τίς ὁ σωζόμενος πλούσιος, c. 42 (comp. Eusebius iii. 24).

[3] We omit, with still stronger reason, the work of Prochorus, recently published by Zahn (*Acta Johannis*), of which a young scholar,—Max Bonnet, professor at Montpelier, is preparing a new edition. It is a book of pure imagination, without the least historical value, composed, according to Zahn, between 400 and 600. The Johannean fragments in the work of Leucius, which Zahn is disposed to carry back as far as 130, do not seem to have any greater value. See Overbeck in the *Theol. Liter. Zeit.*, 1881, No. 2.

[4] Ad Eph., c. 12.

that moment with the position of Ignatius, when he wrote to the Ephesians on his way to Rome, is obvious. There was no similar comparison to be made with the life of John. Moreover, the eleventh chapter of this same letter furnishes, perhaps, an allusion to the presence of John at Ephesus: "The Christians of Ephesus," says Ignatius, "have always lived in entire harmony (*συνήνεσαν*) *with the apostles*, in the strength of Jesus Christ." Finally, we must not forget that Ignatius was from Syria, and that he had not been acquainted with John in Asia Minor.

Polycarp, writing to Macedonian Christians, had no particular reason for recalling to them John's ministry at Ephesus. If he speaks to them of Paul, it is because this apostle had founded and several times visited their church; and if he mentions Ignatius, it is because the venerated martyr had just passed through Philippi, at that very moment, as he was going to Rome.

The similar objection, derived from the account of the death of Polycarp, in the Acts of his martyrdom, by the church of Smyrna, is no more serious. Sixty years had passed since John's death, and yet that church could not have written a letter without making mention of him! Hilgenfeld, moreover, rightly notices the title of *apostolic teacher* given to Polycarp (chap. 18), which recalls his personal relations with one or with several of the apostles.

Keim and Scholten find the most decisive argument in the silence of Papias; they even see in the words of this Father the express denial of all connection with the apostle. Irenæus, it is true, did not understand Papias in this way. He thinks, on the contrary, that he can call him *a hearer of John* (Ἰωάννου ἀκουστής). But, it is said, precisely at this point is an error, which Eusebius has noticed and corrected by a more thorough study of the terms which Papias employed. The importance of the testimony of Papias in this question is manifest. Leimbach cites as many as forty-five writers who have treated this subject in these most recent times. We are compelled to study it more closely.

First of all, what is the epoch of Papias, and what the date of his work? Irenæus adds to the title of *hearer of John*, which he gives to him, that of *companion of Polycarp* (Πολυκάρπου ἑταῖρος). This term denotes a *contemporary*. Now, the most recent investigations place the martyrdom of Polycarp in 155 or 156,[1] and this date appears to be generally adopted at the present day (Renan, Lipsius, Hilgenfeld). As Polycarp himself declares that he had spent eighty-six years in the service of the Lord, his birth must be placed, at the latest, in the year 70. If Papias was his contemporary, therefore, he lived between 70 and 160; and if John died about the year 100, this Father might, chronologically speaking, have been in contact with the apostle up to the age of thirty. Irenæus, at the same time, calls Papias a man of Christian antiquity (*ἀρχαῖος ἀνήρ*); Papias belonged, then, like Polycarp, to the generation which immediately followed the

[1] Waddington, *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, tome xxvi., 2e partie, p. 232 et suiv.

apostles. There is, finally, in the very fragment which we are about to study, an expression which leads us to the same conclusion. Papias says that he informed himself concerning "that whichAndrew, and then Peter, Philip, etc., etc., *said* (εἶπεν), and that which Aristion and John the Presbyter, the disciples of the Lord, *say* (λέγουσιν)." This contrast between the past *said* and the present *say* is too marked to be accidental. It implies, as at the present day Keim, Hilgenfeld and Mangold acknowledge, that at the time when Papias wrote the two last-named personages were still living;[1] and, since they are both designated as *personal* disciples of Jesus, they can only, at the latest, have lived until about the year 110–120. It was, then, at this period also—at the latest—that Papias wrote. He was then thirty to forty years old.[2]

Now the following is the fragment quoted by Eusebius.[3] The question will be whether the personal relation of Papias with John the apostle is *affirmed*, as Irenæus thinks, or *excluded*, as Eusebius claims, by the terms employed in this much discussed passage.

"Now I shall not fail to add to my explanations also (συγκατατάξαι[4] ταῖς ἑρμηνείαις) all that which I have formerly very well learned and very well remembered from the elders (παρὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων), while guaranteeing to thee the truth of the same. For I did not take pleasure, like the great mass, in those who relate many things, but in those who teach true things; nor in those who spread abroad strange commandments, but in those who spread abroad the commandments given to faith by the Lord and that come[5] from the truth itself. And if, at times, also, one of those who accompanied the elders came to me (εἰ δέ που καὶ παρακολουθηκώς τις τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις ἐλθοι), I inquired about the words of the elders (τοὺς τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἀνέκρινον λόγους): what Andrew said, or Peter (τί Ἀνδρέας ἢ τί Πέτρος εἶπεν), or Philip, or Thomas, or James, or John,[6] or Matthew, or some other of the disciples of the Lord (ἢ τις ἕτερος τῶν τοῦ Κυρίου μαθητῶν); then about *what* Aristion and the presbyter John, the disciples of the Lord, say (ἃ τε[7] Ἀριστίων καὶ ὁ πρεσβύτερος Ἰωάννης, οἱ τοῦ Κυρίου μαθηταί, λέγουσιν), for I

[1] Zahn and Riggenbach think that this present *say* may denote merely the permanence of the *testimony* of these men; Leimbach: that it arises from the fact that Papias thinks that he still hears them speak.—All this would be possible only in so far as the contrast with the past tense *had said* did not exist.

[2] There must be a resolute determination to create a history after one's own fancy, to place, as Volkmar ventures to do, the work of Papias in 165!

[3] *H. E.* iii. 39.

[4] This reading, (and not συντάξαι), appears certain; see Leimbach.

[5] The ambiguity of our translation reproduces the possible meaning of the two readings (παραγινομένας and παραγινομένοις) according to which the words: *and that come* refer either to the commandments or to the individuals themselves.

[6] M. Renan has proposed to reject from the text the words: *or John.* This is absolutely arbitrary, and in that case the conclusion of Eusebius respecting the existence of a second John would lose its foundation.

[7] Papias here substitutes for the interrogative pronoun τί (employed in the preceding clause) the relative pronoun ἅ, because the idea of interrogation is remote This ἅ is also the object of ἀνέκρινον, parallel with the preceding object λόγους (so also Holtzmann). No one, I think, will be tempted to accept Leimbach's translation: ". . . *or which* (τίς) of the disciples of the Lord [has related] that which Aristion or John says . . ." The position of the τε, placed as it is after ἅ, and not after Ἀριστίων, is sufficient to refute this.

did not suppose that that which is derived from books could be as useful to me as that which comes from the living and permanent word."

This passage is made up of two distinct paragraphs, of which the second begins with the words: *"And if at times* (now and then) *also."* Hilgenfeld and others think that the second paragraph is only the commentary on the first, and refers to the same fact. But this interpretation does violence to the text, as the first words prove: *And if at times also* (*εἰ δέ που καί*). This transition indicates an advance, not an identity. The two paragraphs, therefore, refer to different facts.

In the former paragraph, Papias evidently speaks of what he has favorably received and remembered *from the elders themselves*—that is to say, by a communication from them to him personally. This is implied by the use of the preposition *παρά* (*from*), the regular sense of which is that of direct communication; 2. By the adverb *ποτέ* (*formerly*), which, by placing these communications in a past already remote, shows that such a relation has for a long time been no more possible, and that it, consequently, belongs to the youth of the author.

The essential question in relation to the meaning of this first paragraph is the following: Who are these *elders* whom Papias heard in his youth? They cannot be, as Weiffenbach has maintained, the elders or *presbyters* appointed in the churches by the apostles. For how could Papias, the contemporary of Polycarp, one of the men of the older generation to the view of Irenæus, have been *formerly* (in his youth) instructed by these disciples of the apostles! The anachronism resulting from this explanation is a flagrant one. No more, on the other hand, can these elders be, as has been claimed, simply and exclusively the *apostles.* In that case Papias would have used this term, and not the term *elders.* The title elders (*πρεσβύτεροι, seniores*) has, with the Fathers, as Holtzmann has well remarked, a relative meaning. For Irenæus and the men of the third Christian generation, the *elders* are the men of the second, the Polycarps and the Papiases; for these latter, they are the men of the first—the apostles, first of all, and, besides them, every immediate witness and disciple of the Lord. This clearly appears from the second paragraph in which Papias gives an enumeration of those whom he calls the elders; it includes seven apostles and two *disciples of the Lord* who were not apostles, Aristion and the presbyter John. As the Apostle John has been named among the seven, it appears to me impossible to identify with the apostle this presbyter having the same name, notwithstanding the reasons given by Zahn and Riggenbach. He is a second John, who lived in Asia Minor, and whom the special surname of elder or presbyter was intended, perhaps, to distinguish from the apostle, who was called either simply John, or the Apostle John.[1]

And is it not evident that the words *ἤ τις ἕτερος* are the conclusion and, as it were, the *et cetera* of the preceding enumeration? Moreover, of what consequence is it *which* of the disciples said such or such a thing! Finally, the ellipsis of the verb is inadmissible.

[1] See the clear and precise setting-forth of this subject by Weiss: *Commentar zum Evangelium Johannis* (6th ed. of Meyer's Commentary).

It follows from this, that, in the first paragraph, Papias declares that he had in former years heard personally from the immediate disciples of Jesus (apostles or non-apostles). He does not name them; but we have no right to exclude from this number the Apostle John, and, because of this statement, to declare false, as Eusebius does in his History, the words of Irenæus: "Papias, a fellow-disciple of Polycarp and *hearer of John*." And this even more, since Irenæus, a native of Asia Minor, had probably been personally acquainted with Papias, and since Eusebius himself, in his *Chronicon*, affirms the personal connection of Papias, as well as that of Polycarp, with St. John.[1]

In the second paragraph, Papias passes from personal to indirect relations. He explains how, at a later period, when he found himself prevented by distance or by the death of the elders from communicating with them, he set himself to the work of continuing to collect the materials for his book. He took advantage of all the opportunities that were offered him by the visits which he received at Hierapolis, to question every one of those who had anywhere met with the elders; and it is on occasion of this statement, that he designates the latter by name: "I asked him what Andrew, Peter . . . John, etc., *said*" (when they were alive) respecting such or such a circumstance in the life of the Lord, "and what the two disciples of the Lord, Aristion and the presbyter John *say*" (at the present time). And why, indeed, even after having communicated directly in his youth with some of these men, may not Papias have sought to gather some indirect information from the lips of those who had enjoyed such intercourse more recently or more abundantly than himself? At all events, as it evidently does not follow from the first paragraph that Papias had not been acquainted with John, so it does follow with equal clearness, from the second, that he was not personally instructed by John the Presbyter; and thus a second error of Eusebius is to be corrected.

What becomes, then, of the modern argument (Keim and others), drawn from the passage of Papias, against the residence of John in Asia? "Papias himself declares," it is said, "that he was not acquainted with any one of the apostles, while he affirms that he was personally acquainted with John the Presbyter. Irenæus, therefore, in speaking of him as the hearer of the Apostle John, has confounded the apostle with the presbyter." The fact is: 1. That Papias affirms his having been acquainted with *elders* (among whom might be John the Apostle); 2. That he denies a personal acquaintance with John the Presbyter; and 3. That he *expressly* distinguishes John the Apostle from John the Presbyter. We see what is the value of the objection drawn from this testimony.

But, it is said, Irenæus may have been mistaken when alleging that the John known to Polycarp was the apostle, whereas this person was actually only the presbyter. And this mistake of Irenæus may have led astray the whole tradition which emanates from him. Keim supports this assertion by the following expression of Irenæus in his letter to Florinus, when

[1] Comp. Zahn, *Patr. apost.* edition of Gebhardt, Harnack, etc.

he is speaking of his relations with Polycarp: "*When I was yet a child* (παῖς ἔτι ὤν)," and by that other similar expression, in his great work, on the same occasion: "*In our first youth* (ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ἡλικίᾳ)." But every one acquainted with the Greek language knows well that such expressions, in particular the word translated by *child* (παῖς), often denote a young man;[1] and could the youngest Christian, who was of such an age as to hear Polycarp, in listening to his narratives, confound a simple presbyter with the Apostle John? Besides, Polycarp himself came to Rome, a short time before his martyrdom; he appealed in the presence of Anicetus to the authority of the Apostle John, in order to support the Paschal observance of Asia Minor. The misapprehension, if it had existed, would infallibly, at that time, have been cleared up. Finally, even if the testimony of Irenæus had been founded on an error, it could not have had the decisive influence on the tradition which is ascribed to it. For there exist other statements which are contemporaneous with his, and which are necessarily independent of it—such as those of Clement in Egypt and Polycrates in Asia Minor; or even anterior to his—such as those of Apollonius in Asia, Polycarp at Rome, and Justin. It is consequently to attempt an impossibility, when we try to make the whole tradition on this point proceed from Irenæus. Irenæus wrote in Gaul about 185; how could he have drawn after him all those writers or witnesses who go back in a continuous series from 190 to 150, and that in all parts of the world![2]

Scholten has acknowledged the impossibility of explaining the error in Keim's way.[3] He thinks that it arose from the Apocalypse, which was attributed to the Apostle John, and which *appeared* to have been composed in Asia.[4]

Mangold himself has replied, with perfect justice, that it is, on the contrary, only the certainty of John's residence in Asia which could have brought the churches of that region to ascribe to him the composition of the Apocalypse.[5] If Justin himself, while he resided at Ephesus, where he maintained his public dispute with Trypho, had not ascertained the certainty of John's residence in that country, could he have conceived the idea of ascribing to him so positively a book, the first chapters of which manifestly imply an Asiatic origin?

Moreover, this tradition was so widely spread abroad throughout the churches of Asia Minor, that Irenæus says that he had been acquainted

[1] John is called παῖς, by the Fathers, at the time when he becomes a disciple of Jesus.

[2] Against the testimony of Polycrates has been alleged the error contained in his letter to Victor, as to the *deacon* Philip, who, he says, was *one of the Twelve*. Steitz's hypothesis which regards the words, "*who was one of the seven*," as interpolated in the text of Acts xxi. 8, would overthrow the objection. But, in any case, if there is an error (which cannot be fully proved) there remains a great difference between an apostolic man, such as the evangelist Philip, who had played so great a part in the narrative of the Acts, and who, as a consequence, might be confounded with the apostle, and a man as obscure as the presbyter John.

[3] He decides in favor of Steitz, who has proved that the idea of John's residence in Asia *existed already* when Apollonius and Irenæus wrote.

[4] Keim does not altogether reject this explanation. He says, "The Apocalypse came in also as a help."

[5] Notes, in the 3d edition of Bleek's *Introduction*, p. 168.

with *several presbyters*, who, by reason of their *personal relations* with the Apostle John, testified to the authenticity of the number 666 (in opposition to the variant 616). Finally, how can we dispose of the testimony contained in the letter to Florinus? Scholten, it is true, has attempted to prove this document to be unauthentic. Hilgenfeld calls this attempt a *desperate undertaking*.[1] We will add: and a useless one, even in case it is successful; for the letter of Irenæus to Victor, which no one tries to dispute, remains and is sufficient. Besides, there is nothing weaker than the arguments by which Scholten seeks to justify this act of critical violence.[2] There is but one true reason—that which arises from the admission: If the letter were authentic, the personal relation of Polycarp to John the apostle could be no longer denied. Very well! we may say, the authenticity of this letter remains unassailable, and, by the admission of Scholten himself, the personal relation of Polycarp to John cannot be denied.

But it is claimed that, as the Apocalypse presupposes the death of all the apostles as an accomplished fact, and that in the year 68,[3] the Apostle John could not have been still living about the year 100. And what, then, are the words of the Apocalypse from which the death of all the apostles is inferred? They are the following, according to the text which is now established (xviii. 20): "Rejoice thou heaven and ye saints and apostles and prophets (*οἱ ἅγιοι καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ προφῆται*), because God has taken upon the earth the vengeance which was due to you." This passage assuredly proves that, at the date of the composition of the Apocalypse, there were in heaven a certain number of saints, apostles and prophets, who had suffered martyrdom. But these apostles are as far from being *all* the apostles as these saints are from being *all* the saints![4]

Thus the objections against the unanimously authenticated historical fact of the residence of John in Asia,[5] to which critical prejudices have given rise, vanish away.

Tradition does not merely attest John's residence in Asia in a general way; it reports, in addition, many particular incidents which may indeed

[1] *Einleitung*, p. 397.

[2] Thus he asks how Eusebius procured that letter; how the relation of Polycarp with John is compatible with his death in 168 (we ought to say 156); why Irenæus does not recall to Florinus his rank of presbyter of the Roman Church; and other arguments of like force.

[3] We do not here discuss this alleged date of the Apocalypse; we believe that we have elsewhere demonstrated its falsity. (*Études biblique*, tome ii. 5e étude.)

[4] On the objection derived from the account of the murder of John by the Jews, in the Chronicle of Georgius Hamartôlos, see page 51.

[5] In no question, perhaps, is the decisive influence of the will on the estimate of facts more distinctly observed. Hilgenfeld, Baur's disciple, and Baur himself have need of John's residence in Asia, for it is the foundation of their argument against the authenticity of our Gospel, which is derived from the Apocalypse and the Paschal controversy. What happens? They find the testimonies which attest this fact perfectly convincing. Keim, on the contrary, for whom that residence is a very troublesome fact (because the remote date which he assigns for the composition of our Gospel would be too near the time of that residence), declares these same testimonies valueless. What are we to think, after this, of the so much vaunted objectivity of historico-critical studies? It is plain:—each critical judgment is determined by a sympathy or an antipathy which warps the understanding.

have been amplified, but which cannot have been wholly invented. In any case, these anecdotes imply a well-established conviction of the reality of this residence.

There is, for example, the meeting of John with the heretic Cerinthus in a public bath, at Ephesus. "There are still living," says Irenæus (*Adv. Haer.* iii. 4), "people who have heard Polycarp relate that John, having entered a bath-house at Ephesus and having seen Cerinthus inside, suddenly withdrew, without having bathed, saying: Let us go out, lest the house fall down because Cerinthus, the enemy of the truth, is there." This well attested incident recalls the vividness of impressions in the young apostle, who refused the right of healing in the name of Jesus to the believer who did not outwardly walk with the apostles, or who desired to bring down fire from heaven on the Samaritan village which was hostile to Jesus. Or, again, there is the incident, related by Clement of Alexandria, of the young man who was entrusted by John to a bishop of Asia Minor, and whom the aged apostle succeeded in bringing back from the criminal course upon which he had entered.[1] This incident recalls the ardor of

[1] The following is the incident loaded with the rhetorical amplifications of Clement, as it is found in *Quis dives salvus*, c. 42:

"Listen to that which is related (and it is not a tale, but a true history) of the Apostle John: When he was on his return from Patmos to Ephesus, after the death of the tyrant, he visited the surrounding countries for the purpose of establishing bishops and constituting churches. One day, in a city near to Ephesus, after having exhorted the brethren and regulated the affairs, he noticed a spirited and beautiful young man, and, feeling himself immediately attracted to him, he said to the bishop: 'I place him on thy heart and on that of the Church.' The bishop promised the apostle to take care of him. He received him into his house, instructed him and watched over him until he could admit him to baptism. But, after he had received the seal of the Lord, the bishop relaxed in his watchfulness. The young man, set free too soon, frequented bad society, gave himself up to all sorts of excess, and ended by stopping and robbing passengers on the highway. As a mettlesome horse, when he has once left the road, dashes blindly down the precipice, so he, borne on by his natural character, plunged into the abyss of perdition. Despairing henceforth of forgiveness, he yet desired at least to do something great in this criminal life. He gathers together his companions in debauchery and forms them into a band of brigands, of whom he becomes the chief, and soon he surpasses them all in the thirst for blood and violence.

"After a certain lapse of time, John returned to this same city; having finished all that he had to do there, he asks the bishop, 'Well, restore now the pledge which the Lord and I have entrusted to thee in the presence of the Church.' The latter, dismayed, thinks that it is a matter of a sum of money which had been entrusted to him: 'Not at all,' answers John, 'but the young man, the soul of thy brother!' The old man sighs, and bursting into tears, answers: 'He is dead!'—'Dead!' replies the Lord's disciple; 'and by what sort of death?' 'Dead to God! He became ungodly and then a robber. He occupies, with his companions, the summit of this mountain.' On hearing these words, the apostle rends his garments, smites his head and cries out: 'Oh, to what a guardian have I entrusted the soul of my brother!' He takes a horse and a guide, and goes directly to the place where the robbers are. He is seized by the sentinels, and, far from seeking to escape, he says: 'It is for this very thing that I am come; conduct me to your chief.' The latter, fully armed, awaits his arrival. But as soon as he recognizes in the one who is approaching the Apostle John, he takes to flight. John, forgetting his age, runs after him, crying: 'Why dost thou fly from me, oh my son, from me thy father? Thou in arms, I an unarmed old man? Have pity on me! My son, fear not! There is still hope of life for thee! I am willing myself to assume the burden of all before Christ. If it is necessary, I will die for thee, as Christ died for us. Stop! Believe! It is Christ who sends me!' The young man, on hearing his words, stops, with downcast eyes. Then he throws away his arms, and

love in the young disciple who, at the first meeting with Jesus had given himself up wholly to Him, and whom Jesus had made *His friend.*

Clement says that the apostle returned from Patmos to Ephesus after the death of the tyrant. Tertullian (*De praescript. haer.* c. 36) relates that that exile was preceded by a journey to Rome; and he adds the following detail: "After the apostle had been plunged in boiling oil and had come out of it safe and sound, he was banished to an island." According to Irenæus it would seem that the tyrant was Domitian.[1] Some scholars claim that a reminder of this punishment undergone by John may be found in the epithet *witness* (or *martyr*) which is given him by Polycrates. But perhaps there is in that narrative simply a fiction, to which the words addressed by Jesus to the two sons of Zebedee may have given rise: "Ye shall be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with," words the literal realization of which is sought for in vain in the life of John. As to the exile in Patmos, it might also be supposed that that story is merely an inference drawn from Apoc. i. Nevertheless, Eusebius says: "*Tradition states* (λόγος ἔχει);" and as history proves the fact of exiles of this sort under Domitian, and that precisely for the crime of the Christian faith,[2] there may well be more in it than the product of an exegetical combination. This exile and the composition of the Apocalypse are placed by Epiphanius in the reign of Claudius (from the year 41 to the year 54). This date is positively absurd, since at that epoch the churches of Asia Minor, to which the Apocalypse is addressed, had no existence. Renan has supposed[3] that the legend of the martyrdom of John might have arisen from the fact that this apostle had had to undergo a sentence at Rome at the same time as Peter and Paul. But this hypothesis is not sufficiently supported. Finally, according to Augustine, he drank a cup of poison without feeling any injury from it, and according to the anti-Montanist writer, Apollonius, (about 180), John raised to life a dead man at Ephesus (Eusebius, v. 18); two legends, which are perhaps connected with Matt. x. 8 and Mark xvi. 18. Steitz has supposed that the latter was only an alteration of the history of the young brigand rescued by John from perdition.

Clement of Alexandria thus describes the ministry of edification and organization which the apostle exercised in Asia: "He visited the churches, instituted bishops and regulated affairs." Rothe, Thiersch and Neander himself[4] attribute to the influence exerted by him the very stable constitution of the churches of Asia Minor in the second century,

begins to tremble and weep bitterly. And when the old man comes up, he embraces his knees and asks him for pardon with deep groanings; these tears are for him as if a second baptism; only he refuses and still conceals his right hand. The apostle becoming himself surety for him before the Saviour, with an oath promises him his pardon, falls on his knees, prays, and finally, taking him by the hand, which he withdraws, leads him back to the Church, and there strives so earnestly and powerfully, by fasting and by his discoursing, that he is at length able to restore him to the flock as an example of true regeneration."

[1] For in *Adv. Haer.* v. 33, he places the composition of the Apocalypse under Domitian.

[2] Eusebius, II. E. iii. 18.

[3] *L' Antéchrist*, p. 27 ff.

[4] *Geschichte der Pflanzung der christlichen Kirche*, Vol. II., p. 430.

of which we already find traces in the Apocalypse (*the angel* of the Church), and, a little later, in the epistles of Ignatius. History thus establishes the fact of a visit to these churches made by an eminent apostle, such as St. John was, who crowned the edifice erected by Paul. But the most beautiful monument of the visit of John in these regions is the maturity of faith and Christian life to which the churches of Asia were raised by his ministry. Polycrates, in his enthusiastic and symbolic language, represents to us St. John at this period of his life, as wearing on his forehead, like the Jewish high-priest, the plate of gold with the inscription, Holiness to the Lord. "John," he says, "who rested on the bosom of the Lord, and who became a priest wearing the plate of gold, both witness and teacher." The attempt has been made to find in this passage an absurdity, by taking it in the literal sense; but the thought of the aged bishop is clear: John, the last survivor of the apostolate, had left in the Church of Asia the impression of a pontiff whose forehead was irradiated by the splendor of the holiness of Christ. It is not impossible that, in these three titles which he gives him, Polycrates alludes to the three principal books which were attributed to him: in that of *priest* wearing the sacerdotal frontlet, to the Apocalypse; in that of *witness*, to the Gospel; in that of *teacher*, to the Epistle.

The hour for work had struck in the first place for Simon Peter; he had founded the Church in Israel and planted the standard of the new covenant on the ruins of the theocracy. Paul had followed: his work had been to liberate the Church from the restrictions of expiring Judaism and to open to the Gentiles the door of the kingdom of God. John succeeded them, he who had first come to Jesus, and whom his Master reserved for the last. He consummated the fusion of those heterogeneous elements of which the Church had been formed, and raised Christianity to the relative perfection of which it was, at that time, susceptible.

According to all the traditions,[1] John had never any other spouse than the Church of the Lord, nor any other family than that which he salutes by the name of "my children" in his epistles. Hence the epithet *virginal* (ὁ παρθένιος), by which he is sometimes designated (Epiphanius and Augustine).

We find in John Cassian an anecdote which well describes the memory which he had left behind him in Asia.[2]

[1] Tertullian, *De Monogamia*, c. 17; Ambrosiaster on 2 Cor. xi. 2: "All the apostles, except John and Paul, were married."

[2] We transcribe it here from Hilgenfeld's *Introduction* p. 405: "It is reported that the blessed Evangelist John one day gently caressed a partridge, and that a young man returning from the chase, on seeing him thus engaged, asked him, with astonishment, how so illustrious a man could give himself up to so trivial an occupation? What dost thou carry in thy hand? answered John. A bow, said the young man. Why is it not bent as usual? In order not to take away from it, by bending it too constantly, the elasticity which it should possess at the moment when I shall shoot the arrow. Do not be shocked then, young man, at this short relief which we give to our mind, which otherwise, losing its spring, could not aid us when necessity demands it. This incident is, in any case, a testimony to the calm and serene impression which the old age of John had left in the Church."

V.

THE DEATH OF ST. JOHN.

All the statements of the Fathers relative to the end of John's career, agree on this point, that his life was prolonged even to the limits of extreme old age. Jerome (Ep. to the Gal. vi. 10) relates that, having attained a very great age, and being too feeble to be able any longer to repair to the assemblies of the Church, he had himself carried thither by the young men, and that, having no longer strength to speak much, he contented himself with saying: "My little children, love one another." And when he was asked why he repeated always that single word, his reply was: "Because it is the Lord's commandment, and, if this is done, enough is done." According to the same Jerome, he died, weighed down by old age, sixty-eight years after the Lord's Passion—that is to say, about the year 100. Irenæus says "that he lived until the time of Trajan:" that is, until after the year 98. According to Suidas, he even attained the age of one hundred and twenty years. The letter of Polycrates proves that he was buried at Ephesus (*οὗτος ἐν Ἐφέσῳ κεκοίμηται*). There were shown also in that city two tombs, each of which was said to be that of the apostle, (Eusebius, *H. E.* vii. 25; Jerome, *de vir. ill.*, c. 9), and it is by means of this fact that Eusebius tries to establish the hypothesis of a second John, called *the presbyter*, a contemporary of the apostle. The idea had also been conceived, that John would be exempt from the necessity of paying the common tribute to death. The words that Jesus had addressed to him (John xxi. 22) were quoted: "If I will that he tarry till I come, what is it to thee?" And we learn from St. Augustine that even his death did not cause this strange idea to pass away. In the treatise 124, on the Gospel of John, he relates that, according to some, the apostle was still living—peacefully sleeping in his grave, the proof of which was furnished by the fact that the earth was gently moved by his breathing. Isidore of Seville[1] relates that, when he felt that the day of his departure was come, John caused his grave to be dug; and, bidding his brethren farewell, he laid himself down in it as if in a bed—which, he says, leads some to allege that he is still alive. Some have gone even further than this, and alleged that he was taken up to heaven, as Enoch and Elijah were.[2]

A more important fact would be that which is related in a fragment of the chronicle by Georgius Hamartôlos (ninth century), published by Nolte.[3] "After Domitian, Nerva reigned during one year, who, having recalled John from the island, permitted him to dwell at Ephesus (*ἀπέλυσεν οἰκεῖν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ*). Being left as the sole survivor among the twelve disciples, after having composed his Gospel, he was judged worthy of martyrdom; for Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, who was a witness of the fact (*αὐτόπτης τούτου γενόμενος*), relates in the second book of the *Discourses of the Lord* that he was killed by the Jews (*ὅτι ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων ἀνῃρέθη*), thus fulfilling, like his

[1] *De ortu et obitu patrum*, 71.

[2] Hilgenfeld cites as proof pseudo-Hippolytus, Ephrem of Antioch and the *Acta Johannis* in the collection of Apocryphal Acts, published by Tischendorf, 1851.

[3] *Theol. Quartalschrift*, 1862.

brother, the word which Christ had spoken respecting him: Ye shall drink the cup which I must drink. And the learned Origen, also, in his exposition of Matthew, affirms that John thus underwent martyrdom."

Keim and Holtzmann, at once regarding this event as established by evidence, and locating it without hesitation in Palestine because there is a reference to *the Jews*, have drawn from it an *unanswerable* proof as opposing John's residence in Asia Minor.[1] This proceeding proves only one thing: the credulity of science when the matter in hand is to prove what it desires. And, first of all, were there not then in Ephesus also Jews capable of killing the apostle?[2] Then, does not the fragment itself place the scene in Asia: "Nerva permitted John to return *to Ephesus*." Still further, it is as having been a *witness* of the scene that Papias is said to have related it. Did Papias, then, live in Palestine? Finally, supposing that this account were displeasing to the critics and contradicted their system, they would certainly ask how it is possible, if the work of Papias really contained that passage, that none of the Fathers who had his book in their hands, should have been acquainted with this alleged martyrdom of John, or have made mention of it? They would tell us that the quotation which Hamartôlos makes from Origen is false, since that Father relates, indeed, the banishment to Patmos, but nothing more; etc., etc. And, in that case, their criticism would undoubtedly be well founded. All unprejudiced scholars have, in fact, admitted that the chronicler had a false Papias, or an interpolated Papias, in his hands. But in any case, if we accept this point in the account: *killed by the Jews*, it is only logical to see in the testimony given to this fact by Papias as an *eye-witness*, a sure proof of the personal relation which had existed between Papias and the apostle in Asia Minor. And yet Keim and Holtzmann find the means of seeing in it quite the opposite!

We conclude: If, as may be supposed, John was twenty to twenty-five years old, when he was called by Jesus about the year 30, he was from ninety to ninety-five about the year 100, three years after the accession of Trajan. There is nothing improbable in this. Consequently, he might have been in personal relations with the Polycarps and Papiases, born about the year 70, and with many other still younger presbyters who, as Irenæus says, *saw him face to face* while he was living in Asia until the time of Trajan.

VI.

THE CHARACTER OF JOHN.

Ardor of affection, vividness of intuition,—such seem to have been, from the point of view of feeling and that of intelligence, the two dominant traits in John's nature. These two tendencies must have

[1] Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, 3d ed., Vol. I., p. 42. "A testimony, newly-discovered, *which puts an end to all illusions*."

[2] Those who have visited the tomb of Polycarp at Smyrna, and who have been received with a shower of stones from the hands of Jewish children when passing through the Jewish quarter, know something of the fanaticism of the Jews of Asia even at the present time. What was it then!

powerfully co-operated in bringing about the very close personal union which was formed between the disciple and his Master. While loving, John contemplated, and the more he contemplated, the more he loved. He was absorbed with this intuition of love and he drew from it his inner life. So he does not, like St. Paul, analyze faith and its object. "John does not discuss," says de Pressensé, "he affirms." It is enough for him to state the truth, in order that whoever loves it may receive it, as he has himself received it, by way of immediate intuition, rather than of reasoning. We may apply to the Apostle John, in the highest degree, what Renan has said of the Semite: "He proceeds by intuition, not by deduction." At one bound, the heart of John reached the radiant height on which faith has its throne. Already he feels himself in absolute possession of the victory: "He who is born of God sinneth not." The ideal appertains to him, realized in Him whom he loves and in whom he believes.

Peter was distinguished by his practical originating power, scarcely compatible with tender receptivity. Paul united to active energy and the most consummate practical ability the penetrating vigor of an unequalled dialectic. For, although a Semite, he had passed his earliest years in one of the most brilliant centres of Hellenic culture and had there appropriated the acute forms of the occidental mind. John is completely different from both. He could not have laid the foundations of the Christian work, like Peter; he could not have contended, like Paul, with dialectic subtlety against Jewish Rabbinism, and composed the Epistles to the Galatians and the Romans. But, in the closing period of the apostolic age, it was he who was charged with putting the completing work upon the development of the primitive Church, which St. Peter had founded and St. Paul had emancipated. He has bequeathed to the world three works, in which he has exalted to their sublime perfection those three supreme intuitions in the Christian life:—that of the person of Christ, in the Gospel; that of the individual believer, in the first Epistle; and that of the Church, in the Apocalypse. Under three aspects, the same theme:—the divine life realized in man, eternity filling time. One of John's own expressions sums up and binds together these three works:—*eternal life abiding in us.* That life appears in the state of full realization in the first, of progress and struggle in the two others. John, through his writings and his person, is, as it were, the earthly anticipation of the divine festival.

BOOK SECOND.

ANALYSIS AND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

Biedermann, in his *Christian Dogmatics* (p. 254), calls the fourth Gospel "the most wonderful of all religious books." And he adds: "From one end to the other of this work, the most profound religious truth and the most fantastic monstrosity meet not only with one another, but in one another." Neither this admiration nor this disdain can surprise us. For the Johannean conception possesses in the highest degree these two traits, one of which repels pantheism and the other attracts it: the transcendency of the divine personality and the immanence of the perfect life in the finite being.

CHAPTER FIRST.

ANALYSIS.

We do not intend to discuss here the different plans of the Johannean narrative proposed by the commentators.[1] We shall only indicate the course of the narrative as it becomes clear from an attentive study of the book itself.

I. The narrative is preceded by a *preamble* which, as interpreters almost unanimously acknowledge,[2] includes the first eighteen verses of the first chapter. In this introduction, the author sets forth the sublime grandeur and vital importance of the subject which he is about to treat. This subject is nothing less, indeed, than the appearance in Jesus of the perfect revealer,—the communication in His person of the life of God Himself to humanity. To reject this *word made flesh* will thus be the supreme sin and misfortune, as is shown by the example of the rebellious Jews; to receive Him will be to know and possess God, as already the experience of all believers, Jews and Gentiles, proves. The three aspects of the evangelical fact are, consequently, brought out in this prologue: 1. The *Word* as agent of the divine work; 2. The *rejection* of the Word, by the act of

[1] See at the beginning of the commentary. [2] Reuss forms an exception; see at i. 1.

unbelief; 3. The *reception* given to the Word by the act of *faith.* The first of these three ideas is the dominant one in vv. 1–5; the second in vv. 6–11; the third in vv. 12–18.

But we must not regard these three aspects of the narrative which is to follow as being of equal importance. The primordial and fundamental fact in this history, is the appearance and manifestation of the Word. On this permanent foundation the two secondary facts are presented to view alternately—unbelief and faith—the progressive manifestations of which determine the phases of the narrative.

II. The *narrative* opens with the story of the three days, i. 19–42, in which the work of the Son of God began on the earth and in the heart of the evangelist, if it is true, as the greater part of the interpreters admit, that the anonymous companion of Andrew, vv. 35 ff., is no other than the author himself.

On the first day, John the Baptist proclaims before an official deputation of the Sanhedrim the startling fact of the actual presence of the Messiah in the midst of the people: "There is in the midst of you one whom you know not" (ver. 26). The day following, he points out Jesus personally to two of his disciples as the one of whom he had meant to speak; the third day, he lays such emphasis in speaking to them upon that declaration of the day before that the two disciples determine to follow Jesus. This day becomes at the same time the birthday of faith. Both recognize the Messianic dignity of Jesus. Then Andrew brings Simon, his brother, to Jesus; a slight indication, i. 42 (see the exegesis), seems to show that the other disciple likewise brings his own brother (James, the brother of John). The first nucleus of the society of believers is formed.

Three days follow (i. 43–ii. 11); the first two have as their result the adding of two new believers, Philip and Nathanael, to the three or four preceding ones; the third day, that of the marriage-feast at Cana, serves to strengthen the nascent faith of all. Thus faith, born of the testimony of the forerunner and of the contact of the first disciples with Jesus Himself, is extended and confirmed by the increasing spectacle of His glory (ii. 11).

Jesus, on His return to Galilee and still surrounded by His family, abandons Nazareth and comes to take up His abode at Capernaum, a city much more fitted to become the centre of his work (ii. 12).

But the Passover feast draws near. The moment has come for Jesus to begin the Messianic work in the theocratic capital, at Jerusalem, ii. 13–22. From this moment, He calls His disciples to accompany Him constantly (ver. 17). The purification of the temple is a significant appeal to every Israelitish conscience; the people and their rulers are invited by this bold act to co-operate, all of them together, for the spiritual elevation of the theocracy, under the direction of Jesus. If the people yielded themselves to this impulse, all was gained. Instead of this, they remain cold. This is the sign of a secret hostility. The future victory of unbelief is, as it were, decided in principle. Jesus discerns and by a profound saying reveals the gravity of this moment (ver. 19).

Some symptoms of faith, nevertheless, show themselves in the face of this rising opposition (ii. 23–iii. 21); but a carnal alloy disturbs this good movement. It is as *a worker of miracles* that Jesus attracts attention. A remarkable example of this faith which is not *faith* is presented in the person of Nicodemus, a Pharisee, a member of the Sanhedrim. Like several of his colleagues, and many other believers in the capital, he recognizes as belonging to Jesus a divine mission, attested by His miraculous works (iii. 2). Jesus endeavors to give him a purer understanding of the person and work of the Messiah than that which he had derived from Pharisaic teaching, and dismisses him with this farewell which was full of encouragement (ver. 21): "He that doeth the truth cometh to the light." The sequel of the Gospel will show the fulfillment of this promise; comp. vii. 50 ff.; xix. 39 ff.

These few traces of faith, however, do not counterbalance the great fact of the national unbelief which becomes more marked. This tragic fact is the subject of a final testimony which John the Baptist renders to Jesus before he leaves the scene (iii. 22–36). They are both baptizing in Judea; John takes advantage of this proximity to proclaim Him yet once more as the Bridegroom of Israel. Then, in the face of the marked indifference of the people and the rulers towards the Messiah, he gives utterance to that threatening—the last echo of the thunders of Sinai, the final word of the Old Testament (ver. 36): "He that refuseth obedience to the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him."

On the occasion of this momentary contemporaneousness of the two ministries of Jesus and John, the evangelist makes the following remark which surprises us (ver. 24): "For John had not yet been cast into prison." Nothing in the preceding narrative could have given rise to the idea that John had already been arrested. Why this explanation without ground? Certainly the author wishes to correct a contrary opinion which he supposes to exist in the minds of his readers. The comparison with Matt. iv. 12 and Mark i. 14[1] explains for us this correction which is introduced by the way.

With this general unbelief, on the one hand, and this defective faith in some, is joyfully contrasted the spectacle of a whole city which, without the aid of any miracle, welcomes Jesus with faith, as all Israel should have received Him. And it is Samaria which gives this example of faith (iv. 1–42). It is the prelude of the future lot of the Gospel in the world.

Jesus returns to Galilee for the second time (iv. 43–54). The reception which He there meets from His fellow-countrymen is more favorable than that which He found in Judea; they feel themselves honored by the sensation which their fellow-citizen has produced in the capital. But it is always the worker of miracles, the *thaumaturgist*, whom they salute in Him. As an example of this disposition, is related the healing of the son of a prominent personage who hastens from Capernaum to Cana at the first report of the arrival of Jesus.

[1] "Jesus, having heard that John was delivered up, withdrew into Galilee." "After that John was delivered up, Jesus came into Galilee."

We meet here also with a remark (ver. 54) intended to combat a false notion for which the preceding narrative could not have given occasion: the confusion between the two returns to Galilee which had been previously mentioned (i. 44 and iv. 3). The author brings out the distinction between these two arrivals by means of the difference in the two miracles, both performed at Cana, which signalized them. The cause of the confusion which he labors to dispel is easily pointed out: it is found in the narrative of our Synoptics; comp. besides the passages already cited, Luke iv. 14 (together with the entire context which precedes and follows).

Up to this point we have seen the work of Jesus extend itself to all parts of the Holy Land in succession, and we have looked upon various manifestations either of true faith (in the disciples and the inhabitants of Sychar), or of faith mingled with a carnal alloy (in the believers of Jerusalem and Galilee), or of indifference or entire unbelief (at Jerusalem and in Judea), which it called forth. We think that it is in harmony with the evangelist's thought, to make here, at the end of the fourth chapter, a pause in the narrative. Till now we have had only a period of preparation, in which various moral phenomena have been announced, rather than distinctly emphasized. A change is made from chap. v. onward. The general movement, especially at Jerusalem, determines itself in the direction of unbelief; it goes on ever increasing as far as the end of chap. xii., where it reaches its provisional limit. Here the author arrests himself, to cast a glance backward, in order to search into the causes of this moral catastrophe and to point out the irremediable gravity of it. What is related, therefore, from chap. v. to the end of chap. xii., forms the third part of the book, the second part of the narrative properly so called.

III. The development of the national unbelief (chap. v.–xii.). Although Jesus had determined to leave Judea in consequence of a malevolent report made to the Pharisees respecting His work in that region (iv. 1, 3), from chap. v. onward we find Him again at Jerusalem. He desired to make a new attempt in that capital. For this purpose He takes advantage of one of the national feasts, probably that of Purim, which occurred a month before the Passover; His thought undoubtedly was to prolong His sojourn in the capital, if it were possible, until this latter feast. But the healing of the impotent man on a Sabbath caused the concealed hatred on the part of the rulers against Him to break forth; and when He justifies Himself by alleging His filial duty to labor in the work of salvation which His Father is accomplishing, their indignation knows no longer any limits; He is accused of speaking blasphemy in making Himself equal with God. Jesus defends Himself by showing that this alleged equality with God is, in fact, only the most profound dependence on God. Then, in support of this testimony which He bears to Himself, He cites not only that of John the Baptist, but especially that of the Father, first, in the miraculous works which He gives Him to perform, and then in the Scriptures—in particular, in the writings of Moses, in whose name He is accused. By this defense, to which the recently accomplished miracle gives an irresistible force, He escapes the present danger; but He sees Himself obliged im-

mediately to leave Judea, which for a long time remains shut against Him.

In chap. vi. we find Him, therefore, again in Galilee.

The Passover is near (ver. 4). Jesus cannot go and celebrate it at Jerusalem. But God prepares for Him, as well as for His disciples, an equivalent in Galilee. He repairs with them to a desert place; the multitudes follow Him thither; He receives them compassionately and extemporizes for them a divine banquet (the multiplication of the loaves). The people are enraptured; but it is not the hunger and thirst for righteousness which excites them; it is the expectation of the earthly enjoyments and grandeurs of the Messianic Kingdom, which seems to them close at hand; they desire *to make Him a King* (vi. 15). Jesus measures the danger with which this carnal enthusiasm threatens His work. And as He knows how accessible His apostles still are to this spirit of error, and perhaps discerns in some one among them the author of this movement, He makes haste to isolate them from the people by causing them to recross the sea. He Himself remains alone with the multitudes, in order to quiet them; then, He commends His work anew to the Father in solitude, and thereafter, walking on the waters, He rejoins His disciples who are struggling against the wind; and on the next day, in the synagogue of Capernaum, where the people come to rejoin Him, He speaks in such a way as to cool their false zeal. He gives them to understand that He is by no means such a Messiah as the one whom they are seeking, that He is "the heavenly bread" designed to nourish souls that are spiritually hungry. He pushes so far His opposition to the common ideas that almost the whole body of His disciples who habitually follow Him break with Him. Not content with this purification, Jesus even wishes to make it penetrate further, even into the circle of the Twelve, to whom with boldness he gives the liberty of withdrawing also. We can understand that it was especially to Judas, the representative of the carnal Messianic idea among the Twelve, that He thus opened the door; the evangelist himself remarks this as he closes this incomparable narrative (vv. 70–71).

A whole summer passes, respecting which we learn nothing. The feast of Tabernacles draws near (chap. vii.). Jesus has an interview with His brethren; they are astonished that, having already failed to go and celebrate at Jerusalem the two feasts of the Passover and Pentecost, He does not seem disposed to repair to this one, in order to manifest Himself also to His adherents in Judea. He replies to them that the moment for His public manifestation as the Messiah has not yet come. This moment, indeed—He knows it well—will infallibly be that of His death; now His work is not yet finished. He repairs to Jerusalem, however, but secretly, as it were, and only towards the middle of the feast; He thus takes the authorities by surprise, and gives them no time to take measures against Him. On the last and great day of the feast, He compares Himself to the rock in the wilderness whose waters of old quenched the thirst of the fainting people. Lively discussions in regard to Him arise among His hearers. At every word which He utters He is interrupted by His adversa-

ries, and while a part of His hearers recognize in Him a prophet, and some even declare Him to be the Christ, He is obliged to reproach others with cherishing towards Him feelings inspired by the one who is a liar and murderer from the beginning. All the discourses which fill chaps. vii. and viii. are summed up, as He Himself says, in these two words: *judgment* and *testimony;* judgment on the moral state of the people, testimony given to His own Messianic and divine character. A first judicial measure is taken against Him. Officers are sent out by the authorities to lay hold of Him in the temple where He is speaking (vii. 32). But the power of His word on their consciences and the power of the public sentiment, still favorable to Jesus, arrest them; they return without having laid hands upon Him (ver. 45). The rulers then take a new step. They declare every one excommunicated from the synagogue who shall recognize Jesus as the Messiah (comp. ix. 22); and in consequence of one of His sayings which seems to them blasphemous ("Before Abraham was, I am," viii. 58), they make a first attempt to stone Him.

Chapter ix. also belongs to this sojourn at the feast of Tabernacles. A new Sabbath miracle, the healing of the man who was born blind, exasperates the rulers. In the name of the legal ordinance, this miracle *should* not be, *cannot* have been. The blind man reasons in an inverse way: the miracle *is;* therefore, the Sabbath has not been violated. This unsettled conflict ends with the violent expulsion of the blind man. Jesus reveals to this man His divine character, and, after having cured him of his double blindness, receives him into the number of His own. Thereupon, in chap. x., He describes Himself as the divine Shepherd who brings His own sheep from the ancient theocratic sheepfold, in order to lead them to life, while the mass of the flock is led to the slaughter by those who have constituted themselves their directors and masters. Finally, he announces the incorporation in His flock of new sheep brought from other sheepfolds (ver. 16). On hearing this discourse, there is a still more marked division among the people, between His adversaries and His partisans (vv. 19–21).

Three months elapse; the evangelist does not speak of the use made of them. It cannot be supposed that, in the condition in which matters were, Jesus passed all this time at Jerusalem or even in Judea—He who, before the scenes of this character, had been able to reappear at Jerusalem only unawares. He undoubtedly returned into Galilee. At the end of December, Jesus goes to the feast of the Dedication (x. 22–39). The Jews surround Him, resolved to wrest from Him the grand declaration: "Tell us whether thou art the Christ?" Jesus, as always, affirms the thing while avoiding the word. He emphasizes His perfect unity with the Father, which necessarily implies His Messianic character. The adversaries already take up stones to stone Him. Jesus makes them fall from their hands by this question (ver. 32): "I have shown you from my Father many good works; for which one do you stone me?" He well knew that it was His two previous miracles (chaps. v. and ix.) which had caused their hatred to overflow. Then He appeals, against the accusation

of blasphemy, to the divine character attributed by the Old Testament itself to the theocratic authorities—a fact which should have prepared Israel to believe in the divine character of the supreme messenger, the Messiah.

From Jerusalem Jesus betakes Himself to Perea, into the regions where John had baptized, into that region which had been the cradle of His work (x. 40–42).

It is there (chap. xi.) that the appeal of the sisters of Lazarus reaches Him. We are surprised to see (ver. 1) Bethany designated as *the village of Mary and Martha.* As these two sisters have not yet been named, how can the mention of them serve to give the reader information respecting the village. It must, indeed, be admitted, here also, that the author makes an allusion to other narratives which he supposes to be known to the readers (comp. Luke x. 38–42; then also John xi. 2 with Matt. xxvi. 6–13 and Mark xiv. 3–9). The miracle of the raising of Lazarus completes that for which the two preceding ones had prepared the way. It brings to maturity the plans of Jesus' enemies. At the proposal of Caiaphas (xi. 49, 50), the Sanhedrim decide to rid themselves of the impostor. And while Jesus withdraws to the north, to the neighborhood of an isolated hamlet named Ephraim, the rulers determine at length to take a first public measure against His person. Every Israelite is called upon to tell the place where Jesus is to be found (ver. 57). At that time, perhaps, there sprang up in the heart of Judas the first thought of treachery. Shortly afterwards, six days before the Passover, Jesus sets out for Jerusalem; He stops at Bethany, and there, at a banquet which is offered Him by His friends, He detects the first manifestation of the murderous hatred of Judas (xii. 4, 5).

On the next day the royal entrance of Jesus into His capital takes place; this event realizes the wish which His brethren expressed six months before. His miracles—the raising of Lazarus, in particular—have excited to the highest degree the enthusiasm of the pilgrims who came to the feast; the rulers are paralyzed, as it were, and do nothing. Thus is accomplished the great Messianic act by which, once at least, Jesus says publicly to Israel: "Behold thy King." But, at the same time, the rage of His adversaries is pushed thereby to extremity (xii. 9–19). The resurrection of Lazarus and the public homage which resulted from it—these, therefore, according to the narrative of John, were the two immediate causes of the catastrophe which had long since been preparing.

Jesus was not ignorant of what was passing; He was not indifferent to it. The occasion was afforded Him of giving utterance in the temple itself to the impressions of His heart, in these days when He saw the end approaching. Certain Greeks asked that they might speak with Him (ver. 20). Like an instrument whose stretched strings become sonorous at the first contact with the bow, His soul responded to that appeal. The Greeks? Yes, certainly; the Gentile world is about to open itself; the power of Satan is about to crumble in this vast domain of the Gentile world and to give place to that of the divine monarch. But words cannot

suffice for such a work; death is necessary. It is from the height of the instrument of punishment that Jesus will draw all men to Himself. And what anguish does not that bloody prospect cause Him! His soul is moved, even *troubled* by it. John alone has preserved for us the story of that exceptional hour. It was the close of His public ministry. After having yet once more invited the Jews to believe in the light which was about to be veiled from them, "He departed," he says, "and did hide Himself from them" (ver. 36).

Having arrived at this point, the evangelist casts a glance backward on the way which has been gone over,—on the public ministry of Jesus in Israel. He asks himself how the unbelief of the Jews has been able to resist so many and so great miracles (ver. 37 ff.), so many and so powerful teachings (ver. 44 ff.).

This general blindness, however, had not been universal (ver. 42). The divine light had penetrated into many hearts, even among the members of the Sanhedrim; the fear of the Pharisees alone prevented them from confessing their faith. In fact, even in this part of the Gospel which is devoted to tracing the progress of the national unbelief, the element of faith is not entirely wanting. Throughout the whole narrative, we can follow the steps of a development of faith parallel with, although subordinate to that of unbelief: thus, in the confession of Peter, chap. vi.; in the selection which is effected at Jerusalem (chaps. vii. viii.); in the case of the man born blind, in chap. ix., and in that of those sheep, in chap. x., who, at the shepherd's call, follow Him out of the theocratic sheepfold; finally, in the case of the numerous adherents in Bethany and in that of the multitudes who accompany Jesus on Palm Sunday. These are the hearts prepared to form the Church of Pentecost.

IV. As since chap. v., we have seen the tide of unbelief prevailing, so, from chap. xiii., it is faith in the person of the disciples which becomes the preponderant element of the narrative; and that even till this faith has reached its relative perfection and Jesus is able to give thanks for the finished work (chap. xvii.). This development is effected by manifestations, no longer of power, but of love and light. There is, first, the washing of the feet, intended to make them understand that true glory is found in serving, and to uproot from their hearts the false Messianic ideal which still hid from them, in this regard, the divine thought realized in Jesus. Then there are the discourses in which He explains to them in words that which He has just revealed to them in act. First of all, He quiets their minds with regard to the approaching separation (xiii. 31–xiv. 31); it will be followed by a near reunion, His spiritual return. For death will be for Him the way to glory, and if they cannot follow Him now into the perfect communion of the Father, they will be able to do so later in the way which He is about to open to them. In the meantime, by the strength which He will communicate to them, they will accomplish in His stead the work for which He has only been able to prepare. If they love Him, let them rejoice, therefore, in His departure, instead of sorrowing because of it, and let them, as a last farewell, receive His peace. After this,

Jesus transports them in thought to the moment when, by the bond of the Holy Spirit, they will live in Him and He in them, in the same manner as the branch lives when united to the vine (xv. 1–xvi. 15); He points out to them the single duty of this new condition, *to abide in Him* through obedience to His will; then He describes to them, without any reserve, the relation of hostility which will be formed between them and the world; but He reveals to them also the force which will contend by means of them, and by means of which they will conquer; the Spirit, *who shall glorify Him in them.* Finally, in closing (xvi. 16–33), He returns to that impending separation which so sorrowfully preoccupies their thoughts. He vividly portrays to them its brevity, as well as its grand results. And, summing up the object of their faith in these four propositions which answer to one another (ver. 28): "I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world; and now I leave the world, and go to the Father," He illuminates their minds with such a vivid clearness that the promised day, that of the Holy Spirit, seems to them to have arrived, and they cry out: "We believe that thou camest forth from God!" Jesus answers them: "*At last ye believe!*" And to this profession of their faith he affixes, in chap. xvii., the seal of the act of thanksgiving and prayer. He asks of the Father for Himself the reinstatement in His condition of glory which is indispensable to Him, in order that He may give eternal life to those who believe in Him on the earth. He gives thanks for the gaining of these eleven men; He prays for their preservation and their perfect consecration to the work which He entrusts to them. He intercedes, finally, for the whole world, to which their word is to bring salvation. This prayer of chap. xvii. recapitulates, in the most solemn form, the work accomplished in His disciples chaps. xiii.–xvii., after the same manner as the retrospective view at the end of chap. xii. summed up the development of unbelief in the nation and among its rulers (chaps. v.–xii.). Nevertheless, as the element of faith was not wanting in the part describing unbelief, so also the fact of unbelief is found in this picture of the development of faith. It is represented in the inmost circle of the disciples by the traitor, whose presence is several times recalled to mind in the course of chap. xiii. The departure of Judas (ver. 30), marks the moment when that impure element finally gives place to the spirit of Jesus.

The history of Jesus contains something more and other than the revelation of the character of God and the impressions of faith and unbelief to which that revelation gives rise among men. The essential fact in this history is the work of reconciliation which is accomplished, and which prepares the way for the communication of the life of God Himself to believers. Here is the reason why the history of Jesus includes, besides the picture of His ministry of teaching, the account of His death and resurrection.[1] It is by means of these last facts that faith will enter into

[1] It is easy to observe the embarrassment of those who, like Reuss, Hilgenfeld, etc., make of the idea of the *revelation of the Logos* the substance of the narrative of our Gospel. They cannot account for the two following parts.

complete possession of its object and will reach its full maturity, as it is by means of them, also, that the refusal will be consummated which constitutes final unbelief.

V. The whole story of the Passion, in chaps. xviii. and xix., is related from the point of view of Jewish unbelief, which is consummated in putting the Messiah to death. This part is connected with the previous one, in which the development of this unbelief was related (v.–xii.). At the very outset, we remark the complete omission of the scene in Gethsemane; but, after the numerous allusions to the Synoptical narratives which we have already established, these words: "Having said this, He went away with His disciples beyond the brook Cedron *into a garden, into which He entered with His disciples*," can only be regarded as a reference to the account of that struggle which was known from the earlier writings. Then follows the deliverance of the disciples by reason of the powerful impression of the words: "I am he." On the occasion of the striking of the high priest's servant with the sword, Peter and Malchus are designated by name in this Gospel only. The story of the trial of Jesus mentions only the preliminary examination which took place in the house of Annas. But by expressly designating this appearance for trial as the *first* (ver. 13: "to Annas *first*"), even though a second one is not related, and by indicating the sending of Jesus to Caiaphas (ver. 24: "Annas sent Jesus bound to Caiaphas, the high priest"), the evangelist gives us to understand, as clearly as possible, that he supposes other accounts to be known, which complete what is omitted in his own. The three denials of St. Peter are not related in succession; but they are, as must in reality have been the fact, interwoven with the phases of the trial of Jesus (xviii. 15–27). The description of the appearance before Pilate (xviii. 28–xix. 16) reveals with an admirable precision the tactics of the Jews, at once audacious and crafty. The instinct of truth and the respect for the mysterious person of Jesus which restrain Pilate until he finally yields to the requirements of personal interest, the cunning of the Jews, who pass without shame from one charge to another, and end by wresting from Pilate through fear what they despair of obtaining from him in the name of justice, but who only obtain this shameful victory by renouncing their dearest hope and binding themselves as vassals to the heathen empire (xix. 15: "We have no king but Cæsar"),—all this is described with an incomparable knowledge of the situation. This is, perhaps, the master-piece of the Johannean narrative.

One feature of the story should be particularly noticed. In xviii. 28, the Jews are unwilling to enter into Pilate's palace—"that they might not be defiled, but might eat the Passover." The Paschal feast was therefore not yet celebrated on the day of Christ's death, according to our Gospel; it was to be celebrated only in the evening. It was, therefore, the 14th of Nisan, the day of *the preparation* of the Passover. This circumstance is so purposely made prominent in several other passages (xiii. 1, 29; xix. 31, etc.), that we are led to think of other narratives which placed the death of Christ only on the *following* day, the 15th of Nisan, and after the Paschal

supper. Now this is what the Synoptical account seems to do. A new proof of the constant relation existing between the two narratives.

In the picture of the crucifixion, the disciple whom Jesus loved—that mysterious personage who had already played a quite peculiar part in the last evening—is found, as the only one among the disciples, near the cross. To him Jesus entrusts His mother. It is he, also, who sees the water and the blood flow from the pierced side of Jesus, and who verifies in this single fact the simultaneous accomplishment of two prophecies.

VI. The story of the resurrection (chap. xx.) includes the description of three appearances which took place in Judea: that which was granted to Mary Magdalene, near the sepulchre; that which, in the evening, took place in the presence of all the disciples, and in which Jesus renewed to the apostles their commission, and imparted to them the first-fruits of Pentecost; and, finally, that which occurred eight days afterwards, and in which the obstinate unbelief of Thomas was overcome. From this we see that, just as the element of faith was not entirely wanting in the scenes of the Passion (it is sufficient to recall to mind the parts played by the disciple whom Jesus loved, the women, Joseph of Arimathea, and Nicodemus), so the element of unbelief is no more wanting in the portion intended to describe the final triumph of faith. The exclamation of adoration uttered by Thomas, "My Lord and my God!" in which the faith of the most incredulous of the disciples suddenly takes the boldest flight and fully reaches the height of its divine object, as it is described in the prologue, forms the conclusion of the narrative. Thus it is that the end connects itself with the starting-point.

These three aspects of the evangelical fact already indicated in the prologue: the Son of God, Jewish unbelief, and the faith of the Church are, accordingly, now fully treated; the subject is exhausted.

VII. The last two verses of chap. xx. are the close of the book.[1] The author declares therein the aim which he set before himself. It is not a complete history that he has desired to relate; it is, as we have ourselves proved, the selection of a certain number of points designed to produce in the readers faith in the Messiahship and divinity of Jesus—a faith in which they will find life as he himself has found it.

VIII. Chap. xxi., in consequence of what precedes, is a supplement. Is it from the hand of the author? The affirmative and negative are still maintained. It is a matter of very little importance; for, even if it is from another writer, the latter has only written out a story which frequently came from the author's lips; so similar are the style and manner of narrating to those of the book itself. This appendix must have been added very early, and before the publication of the work, since it is not wanting in any manuscript or in any version. It completes the story of the appearances of Jesus by giving an account of one which took place in

[1] Hilgenfeld believes himself able to maintain, with some others, that the narrative continues even to the end of chap. xxi. But this is to come into collision with the evidence. Renan says, without hesitation, "With all critics, I make the first redaction of the fourth Gospel end at chap xx." (p. 534).

Galilee. Jesus gives to the disciples, by a symbolic act which connects itself with their former worldly occupation, a pledge of the magnificent success which they will obtain in their future apostleship (xxi. 1–14). Then He reinstates Peter in this office, and announces to him his future martyrdom by which he will completely efface the stain of his denial. The author takes advantage of this opportunity to restore the exact tenor of a saying which Jesus had uttered on that occasion with regard to the disciple whom He loved; He had been erroneously reported as saying that this disciple would not die.

In this appendix we easily remark a want of connection which is foreign to the rest of the Gospel. It is a desultory narrative, and one whose unity can only be established in a somewhat artificial way. It must be considered as an amalgam of various reminiscences, which came on different occasions from the lips of the narrator.[1]

Verses 24 and 25, which close this appendix, are unquestionably from another hand than that of the author of the Gospel. "*We know*," is said in the name of several. The singular, no doubt, returns in ver. 25: "*I suppose*." But he who speaks thus in his own name is none other than that member of the preceding collective body (ver. 24) who holds the pen for his colleagues. They bear witness, all of them at once (ver. 24), by means of his pen (ver. 25), that the disciple especially loved by Jesus is the one "who testifies these things and wrote these things." From the contrast between the present *testifies* and the past *wrote*, it naturally follows that the writers of these lines added them during the lifetime of the author and when his work was already finished.

The entire book, thus, is composed of *eight* parts, of which *five* form the body of the story, or the narrative properly so called; *one* forms the preamble: *one* the conclusion: the *eighth* is a supplement.

The permanent basis of the history which is related is the revelation of Jesus as the Messiah and Son of God (xx. 30, 31). On this basis there appear, at first in a confused way (i. 19–iv.), then more and more plainly, those two decisive moral facts: unbelief and faith; the unbelief which rejects the object of faith in proportion as it reveals itself more completely (v.–xii.), and the faith which apprehends it with an increasing eagerness (xiii.–xvii.); the unbelief which even goes so far as to try to destroy it (xviii.–xix.), and the faith which ends by possessing it in its glorious sublimity (xx.).

This exposition would, of itself, be sufficient to set aside every hypothesis which is opposed to the unity of the work. The fourth Gospel is indeed, according to the expression of Strauss, "the robe without seam for which lots may be cast, but which cannot be divided." It is the admirably graduated and shaded picture of the development of unbelief and of faith in the Word made flesh.

1 "This conclusion resembles," says M. Renan, "a succession of private notes, which have a meaning only for him who wrote them or for the initiated" (p. 535). We do not subscribe to the last words.

CHAPTER SECOND.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

Before approaching the questions which relate to the way in which our Gospel was composed, it is fitting that we should give an exact account not only of the contents of the work, but also of its nature, of its tendency, and of its literary characteristics. This is the study to which we are now to devote ourselves. It is the more indispensable, since in modern times very different ideas on these various subjects have been brought out from those which were previously current.

Thus Reuss maintained even in his earliest works, and still maintains, that the tendency of the fourth Gospel is not historical, but that it is purely theological. The author has inscribed a speculative idea at the beginning of his book; we see from his own narrative, and from comparing it with that of the Synoptics, that he is not afraid to modify the facts in the service of this idea, and he develops it most prominently in the discourses which he puts into the mouth of Jesus, and which form the largest part of his book.

Baur shares in this view. The fourth Gospel is, according to him, an entirely speculative work. The few truly historical elements which may be found in it are facts borrowed from the Synoptical tradition. Keim also, in his *Life of Jesus*, denies all historical value to this work.

Another point which the two leaders of the schools of Strasburg and of Tübingen have sought to demonstrate, is the anti-Judaic tendency of our Gospel. It was generally believed that this work connected itself with the revelations of the Old Testament and with all the theocratic dispensations by a respectful and sympathetic faith. These two critics have endeavored to prove that, to the author's view, the bond between Judaism and the Gospel has no existence, and that there reigns in his book, on the contrary, a sentiment hostile to the entire Israelitish economy.

We shall seek, therefore, first of all to elucidate the following three points, so far as it shall be possible to do this without encroaching upon the questions of the authenticity and aim of the Gospel, which are reserved for the Third Book.

1. The distinctive features of the Johannean narrative and its relations to that of the Synoptic Gospels.
2. The attitude assumed by this work with reference to the Old Testament.
3. The forms of idea and style which are peculiar to it.

§ 1. THE NARRATIVE OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

Our examination here must bear upon three points: the general idea of the book; the facts; the discourses.

I. *The ruling idea of the work.*

At the beginning of this narrative is inscribed a general idea, the notion of the *incarnate* Logos, which may indeed be called the ruling idea of the

entire narrative. This feature, it is asserted, profoundly distinguishes our Gospel from the Synoptical writings. The latter are only collections of isolated facts and detached sayings accidentally united together, and their historical character is obvious; while this speculative notion, placed here at the beginning of the evangelical narrative, immediately betrays a dogmatic tendency and impresses on the whole book the stamp of a *theological treatise*. Reuss even goes so far as to claim that the term *gospel* cannot be applied to this work in the sense in which it is given to the other three, as designating a history of the ministry of Jesus. It is necessary to go back to the wholly spiritual sense which this term had at the beginning, when, in the New Testament, it denoted the message of salvation in itself considered, without the least notion of an historical setting forth of it.

This general estimate seems to me to rest upon two errors. A ruling idea, formulated in the prologue, certainly presides over the narrative which follows, and sums it up. But is this feature peculiar to the fourth Gospel? It is found again in the first Gospel, which is opened by these words, containing, as we have seen, an entire programme: "Genealogy of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham." It is unnecessary to show again how this notion of the Messianic royalty of Jesus and of the fulfillment by Him of all the promises made to Israel in David, and to the world in Abraham, penetrates into the smallest details of Matthew's narrative. The same is true of the Gospel of Mark, which opens with these words: "The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God." This is the formula which sums up the whole narrative that is to follow: Jesus, realizing, in His life as Messiah-King, the wisdom and power of a being who has come from God. St. Luke has not himself expressed the idea which governs his book; but it is nevertheless easy to discover it: the Son of man, the perfect representative of human nature, bringing gratuitously the salvation of God to all that bears the name of man. If, then, the fourth Gospel also has its primal idea—that of the Son of God having appeared in the form of the Son of man—this feature by no means constitutes, as is claimed, a "capital difference" between this work and the other three. The central idea is different from those of these latter three: that is all. Each of them has its own idea, because no one of the four writers has told his story solely for the purpose of telling it. They tell their story, each one of them, in order to set in relief one aspect of the person of Jesus, which they present especially to the faith of their readers. They all propose, not to satisfy curiosity, but to save.

The second error connected with the estimate of Reuss is this: a general idea, placed at the head of a narrative, cannot fail to impair its historical character. This is not so. Would the description of the life and conquests of Alexander the Great become a didactic treatise, because the author gave as an introduction to the history that great idea which his hero was called to realize: the fusion of the East and the West, long separated and hostile, into one civilized world? Or would the author of a life of Napoleon compromise the fidelity of his narrative because he placed it under the control

of this idea: the restoration of France after the revolutionary tempest? Or must one, in order to relate in conformity with the actual truth the life of Luther, give up bestowing upon him the title: The reformer of the Church? Every great historic fact is the expression, the realization of an idea; and this idea constitutes the essence, the greatness, even the truth of the fact. To make this prominent even at the beginning is not to render the fact suspicious; it is to render it intelligible. The presence of an idea at the beginning of a narrative does not, then, exclude its historical character. The only question is to determine whether this idea is the true one, whether it is evolved of itself from the fact, or whether it is imported into it. Hase expresses himself thus on this point: "The nerve of the objection would be cut if Jesus was really, in the metaphysical sense, that which our Gospel teaches (the Word made flesh). I dare not affirm it." And borrowing the avowal which Goethe puts in the mouth of Faust: "I know the message indeed," he says, "but I lack the faith." Well and good! This lack of faith is an individual matter. But the writer confesses that the beaming of an idea across a fact does not resolve it into a myth. A fact without an idea is a body without a soul. A notion like this has no place except in the materialist system.

The prologue of the Johannean gospel has, therefore, in itself nothing incompatible with the strictly historical character of the narrative which is to follow.

No, not necessarily, it is said; but is there not reason to fear that the idea, when once it has taken possession of the author's mind, will influence more or less profoundly the way in which he considers and sets forth the facts? Might it not even happen that, in all good faith, he should invent the situations and events which seemed to him most fitted to place in a clear light the idea which he has formed? Let us see whether it is thus in the case with which we are concerned.

II. *The facts.*

Baur claimed that excepting the small number of materials borrowed from the Synoptics, the facts related here are only creations of the genius of the author, who sought to set forth in this dramatic form the internal dialectics of the idea of the Logos. Reuss, without going quite so far, regards the narrative sometimes as freely modified on behalf of the idea, sometimes as wholly created for its use. Nicodemus, the Samaritan woman, the Greeks of chap. xii., are only fictitious personages, placed on the scene by the author in order to afford the opportunity of putting into the mouth of Jesus the conception of His person which he has formed for himself. The history related in this Gospel has so little reality, that even from the beginning (chap. v.) it seems to have reached its end: the Jews wish already to put Jesus to death (v. 16)! The visits to Jerusalem, which form the salient points of the narration, are fictitious scenes, the theatre of which has been chosen with the design of contrasting the light (Jesus) with the darkness (the Jewish authorities), and of furnishing to

Christ the opportunity of testifying of the divinity of His person. For this same reason, the miracles of the fourth Gospel are made more wonderful than those of the Synoptics; and, besides, they are presented, no longer as works of compassion, but as signs of the divinity of Jesus. The author thus interweaves them into his theory of the Logos. The account of the Last Supper is omitted, because, from his idealistic point of view, the author is satisfied with having set forth the spiritual essence of it in chap. vi. The scene in Gethsemane is left out, because it would present the Logos in a state little worthy of His divine greatness. No healing of a demoniac is related, because the unclean spirits are too ignoble adversaries for such a being. No mention is made of the miraculous birth, because that prodigy is thrown into the shade by the greater miracle of the incarnation, etc., etc. It is thus that the study of the narrative, both in itself and in a comparison of it with that of the Synoptics, reveals at every step the alterations due to the influence of the idea upon the history.

In order to study this grave question with the scrupulous fidelity which it demands, we must begin by verifying the essential characteristics of the narrative which we have to estimate.

The first is certainly the potent *unity* of the story. The narration begins and ends precisely at the point determined by the plan of the work. The author, as we have seen, proposes to relate the gradual and simultaneous development of unbelief and faith under the sway of the increasing manifestations of the Christ as the Son of God. His narrative has, thus, as its starting-point the day on which, for the first time, Jesus was revealed as such by the testimony which John the Baptist, without naming Him as yet, bore to Him in presence of the deputation of the Sanhedrim—a day which was, as a consequence, also that of the first glimmering of faith in Jesus in the hearts of His earliest disciples. On the other hand, the end of the narrative places us at the moment when faith in Christ, fully revealed by His resurrection, attained its height, and, if we may so speak, its normal level in the profession: "My Lord and my God," coming from the lips of the least credulous of the disciples.

Between these two extreme points the history moves in a connected and progressive way, both on the side of Jesus, who, on each occasion and especially at each feast, adds to the revelation of Himself a new feature in harmony with a newly given situation (iii. 14: the brazen serpent; iv. 10: the living water; v. 19: the Son working with the Father; vi. 35: the bread of life; vii. 37: the rock pouring forth living water; viii. 56: the one in whom Abraham rejoices; ix. 5: the light of the world; x. 11: the good shepherd; xi. 25: the resurrection and the life; xii. 15: the humble king of Israel; xiii. 14: the Lord who serves; xiv. 6: the way, the truth and the life; xv. 1: the true vine; xvi. 28: He who has come from the Father and returns to the Father; xvii. 3: Jesus the Christ; xviii. 37: the king in the kingdom of truth; xix. 36: the true Paschal lamb; xx. 28: our Lord and God),—and with respect to faith, which increases by appropriating to itself each one of these testimonies in acts and

words, and of which the progress is frequently marked by forms of expression such as this: "And his disciples believed on him" (ii. 11; comp. vi. 68, 69; xi. 15; xvi. 30, 31; xvii. 8; xx. 8, 29),—and with reference to Jewish unbelief, the hostile measures of which succeed each other with an increase of violence all whose stages we can verify (ii. 18, 19: refusal to participate in the Messianic reformation; v. 16–18: first explosion of hatred and desire for murder; vii. 32: first active measure, in the order given to the officers to arrest Jesus; viii. 59: a first attempt to stone Him; ix. 22: excommunication of every one who acknowledges Him as the Messiah; x. 31: new and more decided attempt to stone Him; xi. 53: meeting of the Sanhedrim in which the death of Jesus is in principle determined upon, so that there remains nothing further except to discover the ways of carrying it into execution; xi. 57: first official measure in this direction through the public summoning of witnesses against Jesus; xiii. 27: contract of the rulers with the traitor; xviii. 3: request for a detachment of Roman soldiers to effect the arrest; xviii. 13 and 24: sittings for examination in the house of Annas and for judgment in that of Caiaphas; xviii. 28: demand for execution addressed to Pilate; xix. 12: last means of intimidation employed to obtain his consent; xix. 16: the execution).—Such is the history which the fourth Gospel traces out. And yet Reuss can seriously put this question: "Is there anywhere the least trace of a progress, a development, in any direction?" (p. 23); and Stap can affirm that "the denouement might be found on the first page as well as on the last;" and, finally, Sabatier can speak of "shufflings about on one spot," which mark the course of our Gospel! Is not the Synoptic narrative, rather, the one against which this charge might be made? For in that narrative Jesus passes suddenly from Galilee to Jerusalem, and dies in that city after only five days of conflict. Is this a sufficient preparation for such a catastrophe?—Reuss takes offence at the fact that, in v. 16, it is said that they already seek to put Him to death. But he may read precisely the same thing in the Gospel of Mark—the one which, in his view, is the most primitive type of the narration—iii. 6: "Then the Pharisees took counsel with the Herodians against him *to put him to death.*" This is said after one of the first miracles, and at the beginning of the Galilean ministry.

The strong unity of the Johannean narrative appears, finally, in the precise and complete data by means of which the course of Jesus' ministry is, in some sort, marked out, so that, by means of this work, and this work only, can we fix its principal dates and make anew the outline of it. Here are the data which it furnishes us, ii. 12, 13: a first Passover, at which Jesus inaugurates His public work; it is followed by a working for several months in Judea, and finally by a return to Galilee by way of Samaria, about the month of December in that same year; chap. v.: a feast at Jerusalem, doubtless that of Purim, in the following spring and a month before the Passover; vi. 4: the second Passover, which Jesus cannot go to Jerusalem to celebrate, so great is the hostility towards Him, and which He passes in Galilee; vii. 2: the feast of Tabernacles, in the

autumn of this second year, to which Jesus is only able to go *incognito* and, as it were, by surprise; x. 22: the feast of Dedication, two months later, in December, when, again, He makes but one appearance in Jerusalem; finally, xii. 1: the third Passover, when He dies. Here is a series of dates outlined by a steady hand, with natural intervals, which gives us sufficient information as to the course and duration of our Lord's ministry, and which affords us the means of tracing out a rational delineation of it. The only story which does not enter organically into this so strongly united whole is that of the adulterous woman, which logically appertains neither to the development of unbelief, nor to that of faith, and which would thus be suspicious to a delicate ear, even if the external testimonies did not as positively exclude it as they do.

But, at the same time, this narrative, so thoroughly one, so consecutive, so graduated, forming such a beautiful whole, is found to be astonishingly *fragmentary*. It begins in the middle of John the Baptist's ministry, without having described the first part of it. It stops with the scene concerning Thomas, without any mention being made of the subsequent appearances in Galilee, or of the ascension itself.—In vi. 70: Jesus says to the apostles: "Have not I chosen you, the Twelve?" And yet there has not been up to this time a single word said of the foundation of the apostolate; the reader is acquainted with only five of the disciples, from the first chapter onward.—At ver. 71, Judas Iscariot is named as a perfectly well-known personage; and yet it is the first time that he is introduced on the scene.—xiv. 22; the presence of another Judas among the Twelve is supposed to be known; and yet it has not been mentioned.—xi. 1, Bethany is called *the village of Mary and Martha, her sister;* and yet the names of these two women have not as yet been given.—xi. 2, Mary is designated as she "who had anointed the Lord with ointment;" and yet this incident, supposed to be known to the reader, is not related until afterwards.—ii. 23, those are spoken of who believed at Jerusalem *on seeing the miracles which Jesus did;* iii. 2, Nicodemus makes allusion to these miracles, and iv. 45, it is said that the Galileans received Jesus on His return *because they had seen the miracles* which He did at Jerusalem; and yet not one of these miracles is related.

We have seen that from the first Passover to Jesus' return to Galilee, chap. iv., seven or eight months elapsed (from April to December). Now, of all that occurred during this time—in this long sojourn in Judea—with the exception of the single conversation with Nicodemus, we know only one fact: the continuance of the baptism of John the Baptist by the side of that of Jesus and the last testimony given by the forerunner (iii. 22 ff.).—From the return of Jesus to Galilee, chap. iv., to His new journey to Jerusalem, chap. v. (feast of Purim), three months elapsed, which the author sums up in this simple expression: *after these things*, v. 1.—Between this journey to Jerusalem and the second Passover. chap. vi., there is a whole month of which we know nothing except this single statement, vi. 2: "And a great multitude followed him, because they saw the miracles which he did on the sick." Of these numerous miracles which attracted

the crowds not one is related!—Between this Passover, chap. vi., and the feast of Tabernacles, chap. vii.,—that is to say, during the six months from April to October,—many things certainly occurred; we have only these two lines thereupon, vii. 1: "And after that Jesus walked in Galilee; for He would not walk in Judea."—Between this feast and x. 22 (December), two months, and then, from that time to the Passover, three months, of which nothing (except the resurrection of Lazarus) is reported.—Thus, of two years and a half, we have twenty months touching which there is complete silence![1]

In xviii. 13, it is said that Jesus was led to the house of Annas *first;* this expression gives notice of a subsequent session in another place. The account of this session is omitted. It is indicated, indeed (ver. 24: "And Annas sent Jesus bound to Caiaphas, the high-priest"), but not related; and yet it is one of the most indispensable links of the history, since in the sitting in the house of Annas a simple examination was carried on, and in order to a capital execution an official session of the Sanhedrim was absolutely necessary, at which the sentence should be pronounced according to certain definite forms. The subsequent appearance before Pilate, when the Jews endeavored to obtain from him the confirmation of the sentence, leaves no doubt as to the fact that it had actually been pronounced. Now all this is omitted in our narrative, as well the session in the house of the high-priest Caiaphas as the pronouncing of the sentence. How are we to explain the omission of such facts?—In iii. 24, these words: "Now John had not yet been cast into prison," imply the idea in the mind of the reader that, at that moment, he had already been arrested. But there is not a word in what precedes which was fitted to occasion such a misapprehension.

Is not such a mode of narrating as this a perpetual enigma? On one side, a texture so firm and close, and on the other as many vacant places as full ones, as much of omission as of matter? Is there a supposition which can in any way explain two such contradictory features of one and the same narrative. Yes; and it is in the relation of our fourth Gospel to the three preceding ones that we must seek this solution, as we shall attempt to show.

The relation of the Johannean narrative to that of the Synoptic Gospels may be characterized by these two features: Constant *correlation*, on the one hand, and striking *independence*, and even *superiority*, on the other.

1. There is no closer adaptation between two wheels fitted to each other in wheelwork, than is observed, on a somewhat attentive study, between the two narratives which we are comparing. The full parts of the one answer to the blanks of the other, as the prominent points of the latter to the vacant spaces of the former. John begins his narrative with

[1] How, in the face of such facts, can a writer who respects himself, write the following lines: "John, we know (!), does not present any trace of gaps, or vacant spaces in which the materials furnished by the Synoptics might be placed." (Stap. *Etudes historiques et critiques*, p 259.)

the last part of the ministry of John the Baptist, without having described the first half of it, without even having given an account of the baptism of Jesus; just the reverse of what we find in the Synoptics. He relates the call of the first believers on the banks of the Jordan, without mentioning their subsequent elevation to the rank of permanent disciples on the shores of the lake of Gennesaret; again, the reverse of the Synoptic narrative. He sets forth a considerably long ministry in Judea, anterior to the Galilean ministry, which the Synoptics omit; then, when he reaches the period of the Galilean ministry so abundantly described by his predecessors, he relates, in common with them, only a single scene belonging to it—that of chap. vi. (we shall see with what motive he makes this exception), and, as for all the rest of these ten to twelve months of Galilean labor, he limits himself to indicating the framework and the compartments of it, without filling them otherwise than by the two brief summaries, ver. 1 of chap. vi. and ver. 1 of chap. vii. These compartments, left vacant, can only be naturally explained as references to other narratives with which the author knows his readers to be acquainted. But, while he passes on thus without entering into the least detail respecting the entire Galilean ministry, he dwells with partiality upon the visits to Jerusalem, which he describes in the most circumstantial way, and the omission of which in the Synoptics is so striking a blank in their narrative. In the last visit to Jerusalem, he omits the embarrassing questions which were addressed to Jesus in the temple, but he relates carefully the endeavor of the Greeks to see Him, which is omitted by all the other narratives. In the description of the last meal, he gives a place to the act of washing the disciples' feet, and omits that of the institution of the Lord's Supper; and in the account of the trial of Jesus, he takes notice of the appearance in the house of Annas, which is omitted by all the others, and, in exchange, passes over in silence the great session of the Sanhedrim in the house of Caiaphas, at which Jesus was condemned to death. In the description of the crucifixion, he calls to mind three expressions of Jesus, which are not reported by his predecessors, and he omits the four mentioned by them. Among the appearances of the risen Lord, those to Mary Magdalene and Thomas, omitted or barely hinted at by the Synoptics, are described in a circumstantial way; one only of the others is recalled, and it is given with quite peculiar details.

Could the closely fitting relation of this Gospel to the Synoptics which we have pointed out be manifested more evidently? We do not by any means conclude from this that John related his story *in order to complete them*—he set before himself, surely, a more elevated aim—but we believe we may affirm that he wrote *completing them;* that to complete was, not his aim, but one of the guiding principles of his narration. There was on the author's part a choice, a selection, determined by the narratives of his predecessors. If his work left us in any doubt on this point, the declaration which closes it must convince us: "*Many other* signs did Jesus in the presence of His disciples, which are not written *in this book* (ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ

τούτῳ)." The expressions here employed signify two things: 1. That he has left aside a part of the facts which he might also have related; 2. That he has omitted these facts because they were already related in other writings than his own (*this book*, in contrast with others). What were these books? It is impossible not to recognize our three Synoptic Gospels, from the following indications: The choice of the Twelve, which John refers to in vi. 70, is related in Mark iii. 13–19 and Luke vi. 12–16. The two sisters, Martha and Mary, designated by name in John xi., as if persons already known, are introduced on the Gospel stage by Luke (x. 38–42). The confusion of the first two returns to Galilee (comp. John i. 44 and iv. 3), which John so evidently makes it a point to dispel (ii. 11 and iv. 54), is found in our three Synoptics (Matt. iv. 12 and parallels); and the idea that no activity of Jesus in Judea had preceded the imprisonment of John the Baptist—an idea which John corrects (iii. 24)—is found expressly enunciated in Matthew and Mark (passages already cited). How, then, can we doubt the close and deliberate correlation of John's narrative with that of the Synoptic Gospels? Renan has always recognized it.[1] And Reuss, after having more or less called it in question,[2] now consents to admit it. He goes even so far, as we all shall soon see, as to transform this correlation into a relation of dependence on the part of John with reference to the Synoptics. Baur and Hilgenfeld likewise recognize this relation, so that it may be regarded as a point which has been gained.

Starting from this fact, therefore, have we not the right to say: That two narratives which are in so close and constant relation to each other cannot be written from entirely different points of view, and that if the first, while seeking, in each of its three forms, to bring out one of the salient characteristics of the person of Jesus, pursues this end on a truly historical path, the same must be the case with the other, which, at every step, completes it and, in its turn, is completed by it?

It will be objected, perhaps, that the author of the Johannean narrative, being an exceedingly able man, labors, by means of all that he borrows from the earlier narratives, not to break with the universally received tradition, and at the same time, by all that he adds of new matter, attempts to make his dogmatic conception prevail, as M. Reuss says: in other words, to secure the triumph of his theory of the Logos.

This explanation must be examined in the light of the other two features which we have pointed out in the relation between our Gospel and the Synoptics. I mean, the complete independence and even the decided historical superiority of the former.

Baur had affirmed the dependence in which John stands with relation

[1] "The position of the Johannean writer is that of an author who is not ignorant of the fact that the subject of which he treats has been already written upon, who approves many things in that which has been said, but who believes that he has superior information and gives it without troubling himself about the others" (p. 531).

[2] He said previously: "One cannot discover, except with difficulty, in this Gospel the traces of a relation with the so-called earlier Gospels. The facts do not constrain us absolutely to hold that the author had any acquaintance with our Synoptic Gospels."

to the Synoptic narrative, as concerning all truly historical information; Holtzmann has sought to prove this in detail, and Reuss now declares himself, in spite of his previous denials, converted to this opinion.[1]

It is necessary, indeed, to distinguish here between the correlation which we have just proved and which, like every relation whatsoever, is a sort of dependence (but only as to the mode of narrating), and the dependence which has a bearing upon the very knowledge of the facts. As we affirm the first, so we are prepared to deny the second, and to affirm that the author of the Johannean narrative is in possession of a source of information which is peculiar to himself, and which, as to the matter of the narrative, renders him absolutely independent of the Synoptical tradition. Let us consult the facts.

It is not from the Synoptics that he knows the public testimony which the forerunner rendered to Jesus. For, before the baptism of Jesus, nothing of the kind is or could be attributed to him by them, and, after the baptism, the Synoptics do not mention anything beyond that single saying of John, which is rather an expression of doubt: "Art thou he that should come, or do we look for another?" And yet the answer of Jesus on occasion of the official inquiry of the Sanhedrim respecting His Messianic authority, (Matt. xxi. 23, and parallels), implies the existence of a public and well-known testimony of the forerunner, such as that which John relates in i. 19 ff.—It is not from the Synoptics that John has derived the account of the first relations of Jesus with His earliest disciples (chap. i.); and yet these relations are necessarily presupposed by the call of the latter to the vocation of fishers of men, on the shores of the lake of Gennesaret (Matt. v. 18 ff.).—It is not from the Synoptics that John has learned that Jesus inaugurated His public ministry by the purification of the temple, since they place this act in His last visit to Jerusalem. Now all the probabilities are in favor of the time assigned to this fact by John. Reuss himself acknowledges it, since according to him, if Jesus was at Jerusalem several times (a fact which he accepts), it is almost impossible to hold that He had been indifferent the first time to that which on a later occasion could excite His holy indignation.[2]—It is certainly not from the Synoptics that John borrows the correction which he brings to their own story, iii. 24, by recalling the fact that Jesus and His forerunner had baptized simultaneously in Judea at the beginning of the Lord's ministry, and iv. 54 (comp. i. 44 and iv. 3), by clearly distinguishing between the first two returns of Jesus to Galilee which are blended into one by the Synoptic narrative. And yet every one is obliged to admit that these corrections are well-founded rectifications and in harmony with the actual course of the history; for (1) if Jesus had not at first taught publicly in Judea, the imprisonment of John the Baptist would not have been a reason for His withdrawing and departing again for Galilee (Weizsäcker);

[1] "In my previous works, I believed myself able to maintain the independence of the fourth Gospel in regard to the Synoptic text. I am obliged to go over to the opposite opinion, which is at present shared even by those who in other respects adopt the traditional views." (*La Théologie johannique*, p. 76.)

[2] P. 139.

and (2) there remains a manifest gap in the Synoptic narrative between the baptism of Jesus and the imprisonment of John the Baptist, a gap which the Johannean narrative exactly fills (Holtzmann).—Westcott with perfect fitness says: "Matt. iv. 12 and Mark i. 14 have a meaning only on the supposition of a *Judean* ministry of Jesus, which these books have not related."

It is not from the Synoptics that John borrows the account of the visits to Jerusalem; here is the feature which most profoundly distinguishes his narrative from theirs. And yet, if the Johannean narrative possesses a pronounced character of superiority to the other, we may say it is certainly in this point. Keim speaks very pathetically, it is true, of these "breathless journeys"[1] of Jesus to Jerusalem! Nevertheless, all are not agreed on this subject. Weiss expresses himself thus: "All the historical considerations speak in favor of John's narrative, and in the Synoptic narratives themselves there are not wanting indications which lead to this way of understanding the history."[2] Renan himself remarks that "persons transplanted only a few days before [the disciples, on the supposition that they also had not previously visited Jerusalem] would not have chosen that city for their capital . . . " And he adds, "If things had occurred as Mark and Matthew would have it, Christianity would have been developed especially in Galilee."[3] Hausrath and Holtzmann express themselves in the same way.[4] Without pursuing this enumeration, let us limit ourselves to quoting Hase, who, in a few lines, appears to us to sum up the question: "So far as we are acquainted with the circumstances of the time, it was natural that Jesus should seek to obtain the national recognition [of His Messianic dignity] at the very centre of the life of the people, in the holy city; and even the mortal hatred of the priests at Jerusalem would be more difficult to explain, if Jesus had never threatened them near at hand. But it is very natural that these journeys to Jerusalem, in so far as they are chronological determinations, should be effaced in the Galilean tradition and blended in the single and last journey which led Jesus to His death. In the Synoptic Gospels are preserved the traces of an earlier sojourn of Jesus in the capital and its neighborhood: 'Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets and stonest them that are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings; and ye would not!'" This sorrowful exclamation which escaped from the deepest depths of the heart of Jesus, finds no satisfactory explanation in the visit of a few days which Jesus made in that city according to the Synoptics. The explanation of Baur is a subterfuge—he thinks that the children of Jerusalem are taken here as representatives of the whole people, while this exclamation is addressed in the most precise and local way to Jerusalem itself; as also it is a mere shift of Strauss to find here the quotation of a passage from a lost work ("The Wisdom of God"),—a passage which, in

[1] "Das athemlose Festreisen."
[2] Introd., p. 35.
[3] *Vie de Jésus*, 13th ed., p. 487.
[4] *Neutest. Zeitgesch.* I., p. 386; *Gesch. des Volks Israel*, II., pp. 372, 373.

any case, could have been thus put into the mouth of Jesus only as the public mind remembered more than one visit to Jerusalem. Moreover, according to the Synoptics also, Jesus has hosts at Bethany, to whose house he returns every evening. . . ."[1] Sabatier calls to mind, besides, the owner of the young ass at Bethphage, the person at whose house Jesus caused the Passover supper to be prepared at Jerusalem, Joseph of Arimathea who goes to ask for His body. It is difficult to believe that all these relations of Jesus in Judea were contracted in the few days only which preceded the Passion. Finally, let us not forget the remarkable fact that Luke himself places at a considerably earlier period the first visit of Jesus at the house of Martha and Mary (x. 38 ff.).

Reuss cannot deny the weight of these reasons. While continuing to think that the choice of this theatre was dictated to the author "by the very nature of the antithesis, the antagonism between the Gospel and Judaism," that it is, consequently, the theological conception which created this framework, he is nevertheless obliged to admit "that there are evident traces of a more frequent presence of Jesus in Jerusalem" than that of which the Synoptics speak. But if historical truth is so *evidently* on the side of John, how can it be maintained, on the other hand, that "it is to the theological conception that this framework is due?"[2]

Reuss is likewise led by the facts to give the preference to the *chronological* outline of John's narrative, which assigns to the ministry of Jesus a duration of two years and a half, and not of a single year only, as the Synoptic narrative seems to do. "We do not think," he says, "that it can be affirmed that Jesus employed only a single year of His life in acting upon the spirit of those around Him."[3] Weizsäcker makes the same observation: "The transformation of the previous ideas, views and beliefs of the apostles must have penetrated even to the depths of their minds, in order to their being able to survive the final catastrophe and to rise anew immediately afterwards. In order to this, the schooling of a prolonged intercourse with Jesus was necessary. Neither instructions nor emotions were sufficient here; there was necessity of growing into the inner and personal union with the Master."[4] Renan also declares that the mention of the different visits of Jesus to Jerusalem (and, consequently, of His two or three years of ministry) "constitutes for our Gospel a decisive triumph."[5] Here is no secondary detail in the relation of John to the Synoptics. It is the capital point. How can it be maintained, after such avowals, that the fourth Gospel is dependent on its predecessors? How can we fail to recognize, on the contrary, the complete independence of the materials of which it disposes and their decided *historical* superiority to the tradition recorded in the Synoptics.

In the account of the last evening, the first two Synoptics divide the sayings of Christ into three groups: 1. The revelation of the betrayal and the betrayer; 2. The institution of the Holy Supper; 3. The personal

[1] *Geschichte Jesu, nach acad. Vorles*, p. 40.
[2] *Théol. johann.*, pp. 57–59.
[3] P. 58.
[4] *Untersuchungen*, p. 313.
[5] P. 487.

impressions of Jesus. Luke the same, but in the inverse order. There are always three distinct groups in juxtaposition. This arrangement was that of the traditional narration, which tended to group the homogeneous elements. But it is not that of real life: so it is not found again in John. Here the Lord reverts several times both to the betrayal of Judas and His own impressions. The same difference is seen in the account of Peter's denial. The three acts of denial are united in the Synoptics as if in one place and time; this narrative was one of the ἀπομνημονεύματα (traditional stories), which formed each of them a small, complete whole, in the popular narration. In John we do not find these three acts artificially grouped; they are divided among other facts, as they certainly were in reality; the narrative has found again its natural articulations. This characteristic has not escaped the sagacity of Renan, who expresses himself thus: "The same superiority in the account of Peter's denials. This entire episode in the case of our author is more circumstantial, better explained."

We know that, according to John's account, the day of Christ's death was the 14th of Nisan, the day of the preparation of the Paschal supper, and not, as it seems, at the first glance, in the Synoptics, the 15th, the day after the supper. It has been claimed that this difference arose from the fact that the author of the fourth Gospel wished to make the time of Jesus' death coincide with that at which the Paschal lamb was sacrificed —a ceremony which took place on the 14th in the afternoon; and this in a purely dogmatic and typological interest. It is difficult to understand what the author would have gained by making so violent a transposition of the central fact of the Gospel,—that of the cross. For, after all, the typical relation between the sacrifice of the lamb and the crucifixion of Christ does not depend on the simultaneousness of these two acts. This relation had already been proclaimed by Paul (1 Cor. v. 7: "Christ, our Passover, has been sacrificed for us"); it was recognized by the whole Church, on the ground of the sacramental words: "Do this in remembrance of me," by which Jesus substituted Himself for the Paschal lamb. It is easier, on the other hand, to understand the loss which the author risked by subjecting the history to an alteration of this kind; he compromised in the Church the authority of his work and thereby (to put ourselves at the point of view of those who give this explanation) even that of his conception of the Logos, which, moreover, had nothing to do with typological and Judaic symbolism, and was even contrary to it. But more than this, we shall show, and that by the Synoptics themselves, that the Johannean date is the true one. Reuss cannot help admitting this, with ourselves, for the same reasons (the facts indicated Mark xiv. 21, 46 and parallels, which could not have occurred on a Sabbatical day, such as the 15th of Nisan was).[1] Here also, accordingly, it is John's account which brings to light again the true course of things, left in obscurity by the Synoptic narrative.

We shall not enter into the detailed study of the accounts of the Passion

[1] See *Théol. johann.*, p. 60.

and resurrection. I may limit myself to quoting this general judgment of Renan respecting the last days of Jesus' life: "In all this portion, the fourth Gospel contains particular points of information infinitely superior to those of the Synoptics." And with relation to the fact of the resurrection of Lazarus, he adds: "Now—a singular fact—this narrative is connected with the last pages [of the Gospel history] by such close bonds that, if we reject it as imaginary, the entire edifice of the last weeks of Jesus' life, so solid in our Gospel, crumbles at the same blow."[1] And, in fact, all things in the Johannean narrative are historically bound together: the resurrection of Lazarus determines the ovation of Palm Sunday; and this, joined with the treason of Judas, constrains the Sanhedrim to precipitate the denouement.

It is true that Hilgenfeld regards this explanation of the relation between John and the Synoptics as "a *degrading* of these last, they being nothing more than defective beginnings, of which John's work would be the censor."[2] Reuss several times expresses the same idea: "A singular way of strengthening the faith of the Christian—by suggesting the idea that what he may have previously read in Matthew or in Luke has great need to be corrected."[3] But to complete, is to confirm that which precedes and that which follows the gap which is filled up; and to correct an inaccuracy of detail in a narrative is not to unsettle the authority of the whole—it is, on the contrary, to strengthen it. The corrections and complements brought by John to the Synoptic story have been noticed since the first ages of the Church, but they have not in the least impaired the confidence which the Church has had in those writings.

We now have the necessary elements for resolving these two questions: Is the fourth Gospel, in the truth which it relates, dependent on the Synoptics? In the points where he differs from them, does the author modify the history according to a preconceived and favorite theory?

As to the first question, the facts, as rigidly examined, have just proved that the author of the fourth Gospel possesses a source of information independent of the Synoptic tradition. The negative solution of the second follows plainly from the fact that in case of a difference in the two narrations, it is, in every instance, the Johannean narrative which, *from the historical point of view*, deserves the preference. A narrative which is constantly superior, historically speaking, is secure from the suspicion of being the product of an idea.

What is urged in opposition to this result from facts, which are for the most part conceded by the objectors themselves? It is claimed, in spite of all, that there are found in the Johannean narrative certain traces of dependence on the Synoptic narrative. Holtzmann has exercised his critical adroitness in this domain. The following are some of his discoveries.[4] John says i. 6: "There was a man" (*ἐγένετο ἄνθρωπος*)." It is an imitation of: "There came a word (*ἐγένετο ῥῆμα*)," Luke iii. 2. John says (i. 7): "This one came;" he copies the: "And he came," Luke iii. 3.

[1] P. 514.
[2] *Zeitsch. für wissensch. Theol.*, I., 1880.
[3] P. 32.
[4] *Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol.*, 1869.

The expression: "Lazarus our friend sleepeth" (John xi. 11), reproduces that of Mark v. 39 and parallels: "She is not dead, but sleepeth" (although Mark's term *καθεύδει* is different from John's, *κεκοίμηται*). The sickness of Lazarus (John xi.) is a copy of the representation of Lazarus covered with sores in the parable of Luke xvi. 20, and the whole account of the resurrection of Lazarus of Bethany is only a fiction created after that parable of the wicked rich man. According to Renan, the reverse is the case. The two assertions are of equal value. In Luke, Abraham refuses, as a useless thing, to send back Lazarus who is dead to the earth; in John, Jesus brings him back among the living: what an imitation! It is claimed also, from this point of view, that the representation of Martha and Mary, chap. xi., is an imitation of that in Luke x. 38 ff.; or that the two hundred denarii of Philip (vi. 7) are derived from the text of Mark vi. 37, as the three hundred of Judas (xii. 5) are borrowed from the text of Mark xiv. 5; or again that the strange term *νάρδος πιστική* (pure nard, trustworthy) in John (xii. 3) comes from Mark (xiv. 3). The comparison of the three accounts of the anointing of Jesus at Bethany has produced on Reuss so great an impression, that it has decided his conversion to the view of dependence, maintained by Holtzmann.[1] According to him, indeed, two different anointings are related by the Synoptics; that which took place in Galilee by the hands of a sinful woman, in the house of Simon the Pharisee (Luke vii.), and that which took place at Bethany on the part of a woman of that place, in the house of Simon the leper (Matt. xxvi.; Mark xiv.). "Well," says Reuss, "the author of the fourth Gospel gives us a third version," which can only be understood as an amalgam of the other two. He puts into the mouth of Jesus the same words as the narrative of Mark does. And at the same time he borrows from Luke this characteristic detail,—that the oil was not poured on His head (Mark and Matt.), but on His feet. Moreover, he thinks it good to deviate from the account of the first two Synoptics by transferring the scene from the house of Simon the leper to that of Lazarus, who has recently been raised from the dead. The truth is: 1. That John relates exactly the same scene as Mark and Matthew; but 2. That he relates it with more precise details; and 3. Without contradicting them in the least degree. He is more precise: he indicates exactly the day of the supper; it is that of the arrival of Jesus at Bethany from Jericho, the evening before Palm Sunday; in Matthew and Mark all chronological determination is wanting. He mentions the anointing of *the feet*, that of the head being understood as a matter of course, since it was an act of ordinary civility (comp. Ps. xxiii. 5; Luke vii. 46), while anointing *the feet* with a like perfume was a prodigality altogether extraordinary. It was precisely this exceptional fact which occasioned the murmuring of certain disciples and the following conversation. Then, John alone mentions Judas as the fomenter of the discontent which manifested itself among some of his colleagues. Matthew and Mark employ here only vague terms: *the disciples; some.* But these Gospels themselves, by the place which they

[1] *Théol. johann.*, p. 76, note.

assign to this story—making it an intercalation and, as it were, an episode in that of the treachery of Judas (comp. Mark xiv. 1, 2 and 10, 11, and the parallels in Matt.), indirectly bear testimony to the accuracy of this more precise detail of John's narrative. Tradition had assigned this place to the story of the anointing precisely because of the part of Judas on this occasion, which was as if the prelude to his treachery. It was an association of ideas for which John substitutes the true chronological situation. Finally, John's narrative does not, by any means, contradict the parallel narrative of the two Synoptics as to the house in which the supper took place. For the expression: "And Lazarus was one of those who were at table with him" (in John),—far from proving that the feast took place in the house of Lazarus,—is the indication of exactly the opposite. It would not have been necessary to say that Lazarus was at table in his own house, and that Martha served there. There remains the identical detail of the three hundred denarii and the common term πιστική. There would be no impossibility surely in the fact that, having the narrative of Mark under his eyes, John should have borrowed from it such slight details; his general historical independence would, nevertheless, remain intact. But these borrowings are themselves doubtful; for 1. John's narrative possesses, as we have seen, details which are altogether original; 2. The term πιστική was a technical term, which was used in contrast with the similarly technical one, *pseudo-nard* (see Pliny); 3. The two numbers, being certainly historical, might be transmitted in two accounts which were independent of each other. Moreover, in the narrative of the multiplication of the loaves, the parts ascribed to Philip and Andrew betray in John the same independence of information which we have just proved in that of the anointing in Bethany.

We come to the solution of the second question, the most decisive question: whether the philosophical idea of the Logos, which is believed to be the soul of the narrative, has not exerted an unfavorable influence on the setting forth of the facts, and whether it is not to this influence that we must attribute most of the differences which we notice between this narrative of the history of Jesus and that of the three Synoptics.

The facts which we have just proved contain, in a general way, the answer to this question. If in the cases of divergence previously examined, we have established, in every instance, the incontrovertible *historical* superiority of John's narrative, what follows from this fact? That the author had too much respect for the history which he was relating, to permit the idea which inspired him to be prejudicial to the faithful statement of the facts, or that this governing idea, belonging to the history itself, moved over the narrative, not as a cause of alteration, but as a salutary and conservative rule.

Let us, however, enter into details and take notice of the particular divergences which are cited as specimens of the unfavorable effect of the theological standpoint. The question is either of facts *omitted*, or of narratives *repeated*, with or without modifications, or finally of features *added*, by the Johannean story.

There are three facts, especially, the *omission* of which seems to several critics significant,—the temptation, the institution of the Holy Supper, and the agony in Gethsemane. The first and third of these facts, it is thought, appeared to the author unworthy of the Logos; as for the second, it was enough for him, from his spiritualistic point of view, to have unveiled the essence of it in the discourse of chap. vi.; after that, the outward ceremony had no more value to his view. Does he not proceed in the same way with respect to the baptism? He does not, any more than in the former case, give an account of its institution, but he sets forth its essence, iii. 5. We believe that John's silence respecting these two facts is to be explained in quite a different way. If the author was afraid to compromise the dignity of the Logos by placing Him in conflict with the invisible adversary, would he make Him say, xiv. 30: "I will no longer talk much with you, for the prince of the world cometh?" It must not be forgotten that the starting-point of John's narrative is later than the fact of the temptation. It is the same with the baptism of Jesus, which is also not related, but which the author does not dream of denying, since he distinctly alludes to it in the saying attributed to John the Baptist, i. 32: "I have seen the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove and abiding upon him." The scene of Gethsemane is omitted; but it is sufficiently indicated by that statement, which is really a reference to the Synoptical narratives, xviii. 1: "After that Jesus had said these things, he went forth with his disciples beyond the brook Cedron, *where there was a garden into which he entered, himself and his disciples.*" John takes precisely the same course here as he does with relation to the great session of the Sanhedrim, at which Jesus was condemned to death; that scene, which is necessarily presupposed by the appearance before Pilate, he nevertheless does not relate, but contents himself with indicating it by the words, xviii. 24, "And Annas sent him bound to Caiaphas, the high-priest" (comp. also the words "to Annas *first*," ver. 13). This tacit reference to the Synoptics belongs to John's mode of narrating. Limiting himself to a delicate hint, which should serve as a *nota bene*, he passes over the points with which he knows his readers to be sufficiently well acquainted. If he was afraid of compromising the dignity of the Logos, how should he have related in chap. xii., in a scene which he alone has preserved from oblivion, that inward struggle, the secret of which Jesus did not fear to betray to the people who were about him, ver. 27: "And now is my soul troubled; and what shall I say?" How should he make Him *weep* at the tomb of Lazarus (xi. 35) and represent him as *troubled in His spirit* in the presence of the traitor (xiii. 21)? The omission of the institution of the Holy Supper is no less easily explained. John was not writing the Gospel for neophytes; he was relating his story in the midst of Churches which had been long since founded, and in which the Holy Supper was probably celebrated every week. Far from wishing to describe the ministry of Jesus in its entireness, he set forth the manifestations in acts and words which had especially contributed to the end of revealing to himself the Christ, the Son of God; comp. xx. 30, 31. Now, this aim

did not oblige him to take particular notice of the institution of the Supper; and as this ceremony was sufficiently well-known and universally celebrated, he could omit the institution of it without detriment. No more does he give an account of the institution of baptism, although he makes an allusion to it in iii. 5 and iv. 2.

Three examples ought to show to a cautious criticism how much it needs to be on its guard, when the question is of drawing from omissions like these conclusions as to the hidden intentions of the author. He omits the story of the selection of the twelve apostles; is this in order to disparage them? But he himself puts in the mouth of Jesus (vi. 70) this word: "Have not I *chosen* you, the *twelve?*" Let us suppose that this declaration were not found there, what consequences would not an impassioned criticism draw from the omission? The fourth Gospel does not give an account of the ascension; does it mean to deny it? But in vi. 62, we find these words in the mouth of Jesus: "How will it be, when you shall see the Son of man *ascending where he was before?*" The ground of the omission is, very simply, the fact that the close of the narrative, the scene connected with Thomas, is anterior to this event, which, besides, was suited in the best possible way to the idea of the Logos. If there was in the Synoptics a fact fitted to be used to advantage in behalf of this theory, it was, certainly, that of the transfiguration. Very well! it is omitted, no less than the scene of Gethsemane. Such examples should suffice to bring criticism back from the false path in which it has been wandering for the last forty years, and into which it is drawing after itself an immense public who blindly swear according to it.

But we are arrested in our course here. If the author of the fourth Gospel, they say to us, really proposed to himself to complete the two others, why does he relate a certain number of facts already reported by them: for example, the expulsion of the dealers and the multiplication of the loaves, the anointing by Mary at Bethany and the entrance into Jerusalem on Palm Sunday?

We have already said: the author does not write for the purpose of completing. He proposes to himself a more elevated aim, which he himself points out in xx. 30, 31. But in these same verses he also defines his method, which consists in *selecting*, among the things already written or not yet written, that which best suited the end which he is pursuing: to give the grounds of his faith in Christ the Son of God, in order to the reproduction of the same faith in his readers: "Jesus did many other signs . . . which are not written in this book; but *these are written in order that* . . ." This mode of selecting implies omissions—we have remarked them—but it also authorizes repetitions, on every occasion when the author judges them necessary or even useful to his purpose.

Thus the driving out of the dealers (chap. ii.) is related anew by him, because he knows that it played, in the ministry of Jesus and in the development of the national unbelief, a much more serious part than that which was attributed to it in the Synoptical narrative. The latter, by placing this fact at the end of Jesus' ministry, prevented it from being

looked upon as the bold measure by which Jesus had called His people to join themselves with Him in beginning the spiritual reform of the theocracy; the refusal of the people and their rulers on that occasion ceased thus to be the first step in the path of resistance and rejection.

The multiplication of the loaves (chap. vi.) appeared in the Synoptics only as one among the numerous miracles of Jesus. The important part appertaining to the crisis in the history of Jewish unbelief which resulted from this fact, was in them almost completely effaced. It is this side of the event which John restores to full light. He shows the carnal and political character of the Galilean enthusiasm, which desires, on this occasion, to proclaim the royalty of Jesus, and which, immediately afterwards, is offended at the declarations by which He refuses to promise to His own anything else than the satisfaction of spiritual hunger and thirst. At the same time, the fact thus presented becomes a very conspicuous landmark in the history of faith, by displaying the contrast between the abandoning of Jesus by the greater part of His former disciples and the energetic profession of St. Peter: "To whom else shall we go . . . ? Thou art the Holy One of God."

The story of the anointing at Bethany (chap. xii., 1 ff.) is, on the one side, connected with the resurrection of Lazarus, which has just been related in the preceding chapter, and, on the other, with the treachery of Judas which is to play so important a part in the picture of the last supper. This twofold connection did not appear in the Synoptics, who gave no account of the resurrection of Lazarus, and who, by substituting for the name of Judas the vague expressions: *some* (Mark), *the disciples* (Matt.), prevented the connection between this malevolent manifestation and the monstrous act which was about to follow from being perceived.

The entrance into Jerusalem (xii. 12 ff.) is related so summarily by John that it is really nothing but a complement of the Synoptic narrative. Thus, when he says: "Having found a young ass," and when he adds that, after the ascension, "the disciples remembered that these things were written and *that they had done* these things," while in his own narrative they have done nothing at all to Him, it is evident that, for the complete picture of the scene, he refers to other narratives already known. Only he is obliged to recall the fact to mind, in order to present it, on the one hand, as the effect of the resurrection of Lazarus (vv. 17, 18), and, on the other, as the cause which forced the Sanhedrim to precipitate the execution of the judgment already given against Jesus (ver. 19).

We can easily see, therefore, how these narratives are, not useless repetitions, but essential features in the general picture which the author proposes to himself to trace. Take away these, and you have, not merely a simple omission, but a rent in the very texture of the narrative.

It remains for us to consider a last class of facts in which it is believed that one may detect, in a peculiarly sensible way, the influence exerted upon the narrative by the dogmatic conception which filled the mind of its author. These are the facts and particular features which John adds to the narrative of his predecessors.

One of the features which most profoundly distinguish this Gospel from the preceding ones is, certainly, the chronological framework traced out above. The question is, whether this framework is a product of the idea, or whether it belongs to the actual history. We have already shown that, by the admission of Reuss, the second answer is the true one. What significance would it have, moreover, for the idea of the Logos that the ministry of Jesus continued for one year, or for two years and more?—that He taught and baptized during a first year in Judea, before establishing Himself in Galilee, as John relates, or, on the contrary, that He betook Himself to that country immediately after His baptism by the forerunner, as appears to be indicated by the Synoptics (Matt. iv. 12 and parallels)? It seems rather, that the shorter the sojourn of the Logos on the earth was, the more magnificently does the power of the work accomplished by Him shine forth.—Or again, those large intervals, entirely destitute of facts, which extend from one to three, or even six months,—are they to be considered pure inventions of the author for the benefit of the Logos theory? But with justice, Sabatier asks, "if the author had invented this framework, how should he have neglected to fill it out?" (p. 188). Reuss thinks he cites a decisive fact against the historical tendency of the Johannean narration, when he says: "A single fact fills an entire season vi. 4–vii. 2."[1] But how is it that he does not see that this almost total silence of the author respecting the contents of these six entire months, between the Passover and the Feast of Tabernacles, is the unanswerable proof that he has not invented "this season" with a speculative end in view, and that he mentions it only with a truly historical purpose.

It is in the fact of the visits to Jerusalem that the influence of the idea on the Johannean narration can, as it is thought, be most clearly proved. The great conflict between the light and the darkness demanded the capital as its theatre. But those who reason thus, are themselves forced to recognize in these visits to Jerusalem related by John, an indispensable element of the history—a factor without which neither the tragical catastrophe at Jerusalem, nor the foundation of the Church in this same city, can be understood (see pages 76, 77). These visits are not, then, a product of the idea. All that can be claimed is that they have been *chosen* and made prominent by the author as the principal object of his narrative, because he has judged them particularly fitted to bring out the principal idea of his work. Let us add here, however, that this idea is, by no means, a metaphysical notion, like that of the Logos, but the fact of the development of faith and of unbelief towards Jesus Christ. Moreover, to this *ideal* explanation of the visits to Jerusalem, Sabatier rightly opposes the narrative of chap. vi.: "We may well be surprised," he says, "to see beginning in Galilee, in the synagogue at Capernaum, the crisis whose denouement is to come in Jerusalem. We cannot explain such partial annulling of the system"—we say, for ourselves: of the *alleged* system—"of the author, except by the very distinct recollection which he had of the Galilean crisis."

[1] P. 23.

At this point there arises, undoubtedly, a difficult question—the most obscure of all those which are connected with the relation between John and the Synoptics: that of the omission of the visits to Jerusalem in the latter. We have seen that their whole narrative supposes these visits and requires them; how is it that they give no account of them? This strange omission seems to us explicable only by means of these two facts: one, that our three Synoptics are the redaction of the popular tradition which took form at Jerusalem after the day of Pentecost; the other, that this tradition had, from the beginning, left these visits in the background for some reason which can only be conjectured. As we have seen that the various allusions to the treachery of Judas during the last supper (John xiii.) were blended into one in the traditional and Synoptic story, and that the narrative of John is necessary in order to restore them to their true places; that, in the same way, the story of the denials of Peter, which, in the Synoptics, form a single and unbroken cycle, has found again in John's Gospel its natural articulation—so a similar fact probably occurred with reference to the journeys to Jerusalem. In the popular narration, they all came to be mingled together in that last journey—the only one which really told decisively on the history of the Messianic work, and which consequently remained in the tradition. We readily notice, in studying the three accounts of the Galilean ministry in the Synoptics, that they are divided into certain groups or cycles, each containing the same series of stories; what Lachmann has called the *corpuscula historiæ evangelicæ*. The journeys to Jerusalem did not fall within any of these groups. And when the evangelical tradition thus divided and grouped was committed to writing, these journeys remained in the shade. The very contents of the discourses which Jesus had spoken in the capital might, likewise, contribute to this omission in the ordinary proclaiming of the Gospel. It was not easy to reproduce for the Jewish and Gentile multitudes who heard of the Gospel for the first time, discourses such as that of the fifth chapter of St. John, on the dependence of the Son as related to the Father, and on the various testimonies which the Father bears to the Son; or discussions such as those which are reported in chaps. vii. and viii., where Jesus can no longer say a word without being interrupted by evil-minded hearers. The discourse of chap. vi. held in Galilee, could not be reproduced for the same reason, while the fact of the multiplication of the loaves, which had given occasion to it, remained in the tradition. How much easier, more natural and more immediately useful it was to reproduce varied scenes, like those of the Galilean life, or moral discourses and conversations, like the parables or the Sermon on the Mount? For all these reasons, or for some other besides these which is unknown to us, this important part of the ministry of Jesus was omitted in the tradition and also, afterwards, in our Synoptics. But, as Hase so well says, "as it was in the natural order of things that those who, like Luke, desired to describe the life of Jesus without having lived with Him, should keep to that which was published and believed in the Church respecting that life;—so it was natural also that, if an intimate disciple of the Lord came to undertake

this work, he should keep much less to the common matter which had been accidentally and involuntarily reduced to form, than to his own recollections. Then, such a man was less bound by pious regard for that sacred tradition; for he was also himself a living source of it. I am not at all surprised, therefore, that a Johannean Gospel, in its high originality, deviates from that common matter; much rather, if a Gospel published under the name of this disciple did nothing but repeat that collective inheritance, and did not differ from it more than the Synoptics differ from one another, should I in that case doubt the authenticity of that Gospel."[1]

An objection is also derived from the miraculous works, to the number of seven, which are related in our Gospel; it bears upon these four points: 1. These works have a more marvelous character even than those of the Synoptics; 2. They are presented as manifestations of the glory of the Logos, and no longer as the simple effects of the compassion of Jesus; 3. Several of these miracles are omitted by the Synoptics—a fact which, by reason even of their extraordinary greatness, renders them more suspicious; 4. No casting out of a demon is mentioned.

1. We think that it would be difficult to say wherein the change of the water into wine at Cana, chap. ii., is more extraordinary than the multiplication of the loaves and fishes, related by our four gospels alike. Is it more marvelous to transform the qualities of matter, than to produce it? Has not the latter act a greater analogy to the creative act?—If, in the healing of the son of the royal officer, chap. iv., the miracle is wrought at a distance, the fact is not otherwise in the case of the servant of the centurion at Capernaum, Matt. viii., and in that of the daughter of the Canaanitish woman, Matt. xv.—The impotent man of Bethesda, John v., was sick for thirty-eight years: but what do we know of the time during which the impotent man, whose healing the Synoptics relate with circumstantial particularity, was paralyzed?—If in the story of the walking on the water, John vi., the bark reaches the shore immediately after the arrival of Jesus, the story in Matthew presents a no less extraordinary detail—the person of Peter made to participate in the miracle accomplished in the person of Jesus.—Two miracles remain in which the narrative of John appears to go beyond the analogous facts related by the Synoptics: the healing of the one *born* blind, chap. ix., and the resurrection of Lazarus, who had been dead *four days*. By these two altogether peculiar circumstances, the author proposed, it is said, to glorify the Logos in an extraordinary way.—But how can we make such an intention accord with several sayings which the same author puts into the mouth of Jesus, and in which the value of miracles, as a means of laying a foundation for belief, is expressly combated or at least depreciated. "Unless ye see wonders and signs, ye will not believe" (iv. 48): it is with this reproach that Jesus receives the request of the royal officer. "If ye believe not me,

[1] *Geschichte Jesu*, pp. 39, 40. Let us remark that Hase, in this passage, is discussing the question of the authenticity. As for ourselves, we are as yet treating only that of the historical or speculative character of our narrative.

at least believe the works" (x. 38); comp. also xiv. 11. And yet the author who has preserved such declarations of Jesus, the authenticity and elevated spirituality of which every one recognizes, makes himself the flatterer of the grossest religious materialism, by inventing new miracles and giving them a more wonderful character!

2. Is it true that our Gospel forms a contrast with the Synoptics, in the fact that the latter present the miracles as works of compassion, while in the former they are the signs of the glory of the Logos?—But let us observe, first of all, that in the Gospel of John the miracles are not even ascribed to the power of Jesus. It is one of the characteristic features of this work, that it makes the miracles, so far as Jesus is concerned, acts of *prayer*, while the operative power is ascribed to the Father alone. "I can do *nothing* of myself," says Jesus, v. 30, after the healing of the impotent man. "The works which *God has given me* to do, these works testify for me," He adds, ver. 36. The miracles are an attestation of the Father only because it is the Father who accomplishes them on His behalf. In xi. 41, 42, Jesus says publicly, before the grave of Lazarus: "Father, I thank thee that *thou hast heard me* . . .; I know that *thou hearest me always.*" He must therefore ask, beg for His miracles, as one of us might do; and is it claimed that these acts are the glorification of *His own* divine power? No doubt, it is also said, ii. 11, after the miracle at Cana, that "he manifested *his glory*," and xi. 4, that "the sickness of Lazarus is for the glory of God,"—then it is added: "in order that the Son of God may be glorified thereby." If this glory is not that which He derives from His own power, what can it be? Evidently that which results from His compassion manifested in His prayer, as the glory of the Father results from His love manifested by hearing it. Here, indeed, is the glory "full of *grace* and truth," of which the author himself spoke in i. 14. It is, therefore, very easy to escape from the antithesis which Reuss establishes between the miracles of compassion (in the Synoptics) and those of revelation and of personal glorification (in St. John). The glory of the Son in the latter consists precisely in *obtaining* from the Father that which His compassion asks for. How, for example, is the resurrection of Lazarus introduced in our Gospel? By those words which overflow with tenderness, and which have nothing like them in the Synoptics: "And Jesus loved Martha and her sister and Lazarus" (xi. 5). In order to apprehend completely the manner in which the miracles are presented in our Gospel, it must, indeed, be considered that the true *aim* of these acts passed far beyond the relief of the suffering being who was the object of them. If Jesus was moved only by compassion for individual suffering, why, instead of giving sight to a few blind persons only, did He not exterminate blindness from the world? Why, instead of raising two or three dead persons, did He not annihilate death itself? He did not do it, although His compassion would certainly have impelled Him to it. It was because the suppression of suffering and death is a blessing for humanity only as a corollary of the destruction of sin. The latter must, therefore, precede the former; and the miracles were *signs*, intended to manifest Jesus as the one by whom sin

first, and then suffering and death, are to be one day radically exterminated. As collective love for humanity does not exclude compassion towards a particular individual, so the notion of miracles in John does not exclude the Synoptic point of view, but includes it, while subordinating it to a more general point of view.

3. But how does it happen that of the seven miracles related by John, five are omitted in the previous Gospels. That of Cana naturally fell out with the first year of the ministry which they omitted. That of Bethesda and that of the man who was born blind are omitted with the visits to Jerusalem of which they form a part. That of the son of the royal officer had nothing peculiarly striking in it and had its counterpart in a miracle which is related by the Synoptics, that of the healing of the centurion's servant, which many even identify—wrongly, in our view—with the miracle reported by John.

The omission of the resurrection of Lazarus in the Synoptics is the most difficult fact to explain. It is not enough to say that the miracle took place in Judea; for at the time when it occurred the Synoptics present the Lord to us as sojourning in Perea and in the southern districts. We have only one explanation: tradition remained silent with respect to this fact through consideration for Lazarus and his two sisters. This family lived within a stone's throw of Jerusalem and was thus exposed to the hostile stroke of the Sanhedrim. We read in John xii. 10 that "the chief priests took counsel that they might put Lazarus also to death" together with Jesus, because of the influence which the sight of this man who had been raised from the dead was exerting upon the numerous pilgrims arriving at the capital. The case might have been precisely the same after the day of Pentecost; and it is probable that it was found prudent, for this reason, to pass over this fact in silence in the traditional Gospel story. Either the names of Martha and Mary, in the story of the anointing (see Mark and Matthew), or the name of Bethany, when the two sisters were designated by their names (see the account of Luke x. 38), were likewise omitted. It was, undoubtedly, for a similar reason that, in the account of the arrest of Jesus in Gethsemane, the name of the disciple who drew the sword was suppressed in the tradition (see the three Synoptical narratives), while it is mentioned without scruple by John, who wrote at a time when no harm could any longer come to Peter from this precise indication. Objection is made, it is true, that the Synoptic narratives were drawn up after the death of Peter, and after that of the members of the Bethany family; to what purpose, then, these precautions (see Meyer)? But we too, do not, by any means, ascribe these precautions to the *authors* of these works; we ascribe them to the Gospel tradition, formed at Jerusalem *from the days which followed the day of Pentecost.* We see from the account of the ill treatment to which the Sanhedrim subjected the apostles, from the martyrdom of Stephen and of James, and from the persecutions of which Saul became the instrument, that, at that time, the power of the enemies of Jesus was still unimpaired, and that it was exercised in the most violent manner. Their hatred went

on increasing with the progress of the Church; and there must have been an apprehension, that if any one should put publicly on the scene those who had played a part in that history, he would make them pay very dearly for such an honor. John, who composed his work at a time when there was no longer any Sanhedrim or Jewish people or temple, and who wrote under the sway, not of tradition, but of his own recollections, could, without fear, re-establish the facts in their integrity. This is the reason why he designates Peter as the author of the blow which was given in the scene in Gethsemane, while at the same time, at the suggestion of this name, he calls to mind that of Malchus, the one who was injured; this is the reason why he gives himself up to the happiness of tracing in all its details the wonderful scene of the resurrection of Lazarus.

4. We shall not dwell long upon the omission of the cures of demoniacs. Does not the author himself say that there are also in the history of Jesus *numerous* miracles, *different* from those which he has mentioned (xx. 30: πολλὰ καὶ ἄλλα σημεῖα)? Does not Jesus speak, xiv. 30, of "the prince of this world coming to Him"? There would be nothing, therefore, to prevent the evangelist from speaking of the victories of Jesus over his demoniacal agents. Cases of possession are mentioned only rarely in Greek countries (Acts xvi., xvii.). They were less known there.

The want of historical character, which criticism charges against the accounts of miracles in the fourth Gospel, it discovers again in *the personages* whom this book brings on the stage. They are not, it claims, living beings, but mere types. Nicodemus is the personification of learned Pharisaism. "We see him come, but we do not see him go away;" this is a favorite observation of Reuss; it passes from one of his works to another. He adds: "In any case there is no more question as to him." Finally, he asserts that the reply made by Jesus to this nocturnal visitor "ends in a theoretical exposition of the Gospel," and, consequently, is not at all addressed to him. The same estimate of the Samaritan woman, in chap. iv.; in this woman is simply personified "the artless and confident faith of the poor in spirit." And the same also of the Greeks of chap. xii.: they represent heathenism yearning for salvation. What meaning, indeed, would the mediation of Philip and Andrew have, to which they have recourse, and which was, by no means, necessary in the presence of a being whom every one could freely approach? These are, then, ideal figures, as suits the essential character of a book which is nothing but a treatise on theology.[1]

Reuss would wish, no doubt, that the account of the conversation with Nicodemus had been followed by this remark: And Nicodemus returned to his house. The narrator has not considered this detail necessary. He has judged it more useful to relate to us, in chap. vii., that, in a full session of the Sanhedrim, this same senator, who at the beginning came to Jesus *by night*, had the courage to take up His defense and to expose himself to insult from his colleagues. He has also preferred to show us, on the day

[1] Reuss, pp. 14, 15.

of deepest darkness, when the most intimate friends of Jesus were despairing of Him and His work, this same man offering to His dead body at the foot of the cross a royal homage, and publicly making known his faith in Him, in whom he recognized, at that hour, the true brazen serpent lifted up for the salvation of the world; comp. John iii. 14, 15. Here, it seems, are features which attest the reality of a man, and in presence of which it ought not to be said: "In any case there is no more question as to him." It is also wholly false to call the end of the conversation of Jesus with him, in chap. iii., "a theoretical exposition of the Gospel;" for every word of Jesus sets a feature of the true Messianic programme in direct opposition to the false Pharisaic programme which Nicodemus brought with him: The Messiah must be lifted up like the brazen serpent; which means: and not like a new Solomon. God so loved the world: and not only the Jews. The Son is come to save: and not to judge the uncircumcised. The one who is condemned is whoever does not believe: and not the Gentile as such. The one who is saved is whoever believes: but not the Jew as such. Through the addition of this last word: "He who does the truth *comes to the light*," it is very clear, for every one who puts himself in the situation, that Jesus makes an encouraging allusion to the step which Nicodemus had taken; there is here a farewell full of kindness which is a guaranty for his future progress. Everything in this story, therefore, from the first word to the last, applies personally to Him. Is it possible to picture to oneself a scene more real and life-like than that at Jacob's well? That fatigue of Jesus carried to the extreme, even to exhaustion (*κεκοπιακώς*); that malicious observation of the woman: "How dost thou ask drink of me, who am a Samaritan woman?" that water-pot which she leaves and which remains there as a pledge of her speedy return; those Samaritans hastening towards Jesus, whose eagerness makes upon Him the impression of a harvest already ripening, after a sowing which has just taken place at that very moment; that sower who rejoices to see, once in His life at least, His labor ending in the harvest feast, those people of Sychar who so artlessly attest the difference between their first act of faith, founded solely on the woman's story, and their present faith, the fruit of their contact with Jesus Himself . . . What a painter is made of our author by attributing to his creative imagination such words, such a picture?—Can we say that the Greeks were really lost from sight in the answer which Jesus makes to the communication of Philip and Andrew? But to whom, then, does that expression of xii. 32 apply: "When I shall be lifted up from the earth, I will draw *all men* unto me?" Our Lord means: My teaching and my miracles will not suffice to extend the Kingdom of God over the earth and to make all peoples enter into it; my elevation upon the cross will be needed, followed by my elevation to the throne. Then only, "after it shall have been cast into the earth, will the grain of seed bear much fruit (ver. 24)." Then only will it be possible for the great fact of the fall of Satan's power and of the conversion of the Gentiles to be accomplished, which cannot yet at this moment be realized. The answer of Jesus, therefore, is equivalent, in its meaning, to that which He gave to the Canaanitish

woman: "I am not sent (during my earthly career), except to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." It matters little to us, after this, to know whether the Greeks were admitted or not to a few moments of conversation with the Lord. It was the moral situation in itself and its gravity for Israel and for the world, which the narrator wished to describe, as Jesus Himself had so solemnly characterized it on that occasion; and what proves that it is, indeed, Jesus who spoke in this way, is the following picture of the profound emotion which this first contact with the Gentile world produces in Him: "And now is my soul troubled; and what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour? But for this cause came I unto this hour." Most certainly it may be said:—here are words which were not invented, and which, in any case, were not invented in the interest of the Logos-theory! Now if these words are historical, the entire scene cannot be otherwise. As for the mediation of Philip and Andrew, it is in truth more difficult to comprehend the objection, than to solve it.

After having given an account of the difficulties which have been raised, we ourselves proceed to raise some against this *ideal* explanation of the Johannean narrative. The historical differences between this Gospel and the preceding ones arise, it is said, from the influence exerted by the Logos theory which this work is designed to set forth. But a mass of details in John's narration are either wholly foreign or even opposed to this alleged intention.

We ask of what interest, from the point of view indicated, can be that *tenth hour* so expressly mentioned in i. 40, or that first sojourn of Jesus in Capernaum, indicated in ii. 12, but of which the author does not tell us the least detail; wherein is it of advantage to the Logos idea to mention, viii. 20, that the place where Jesus spoke was the place called *the Treasury* of the temple, or x. 23, that "it was winter" and that "Jesus was walking in Solomon's porch;" or, xi. 54, that after the resurrection of Lazarus, Jesus withdrew to a place named Ephraim and near the desert, without our learning anything of what He did and said there. What does the Logos idea gain from our knowing that the name of the servant whose right ear Peter cut off was called Malchus, and that he was the brother of a servant of the high priest; that it was the apostle Andrew who discovered the small lad carrying the two barley-loaves and the five fishes; or that the disciples had already gone twenty-five furlongs when Jesus overtook them on the sea (vi. 18, 19); or that in the scene at the tomb John moved more quickly than Peter, but Peter was more courageous than John; that it was Philip who said: "Show us the Father;" Thomas who asked: "Make known to us the way;" Judas, "not Iscariot," who wished to know why Jesus would reveal Himself only to believers and not to the world (chap. xiv.)? Is it fictitious realism which the author here indulges in as he introduces these names, these numbers, these minute details, or does he attach to them some symbolic meaning in connection with the theory of the Logos? The seriousness of the work does not allow the first explanation, common sense excludes the second.

More than this: a multitude of details in the narrative are in open contra-

diction to the notion of the Logos as it is ascribed to our author. The Logos wearied and thirsty! The Logos remaining in Galilee in order to escape the death with which He is threatened at Jerusalem, and going to that city only *secretly!* The Logos agitated in His soul and even in His spirit,—then, beginning to weep; praying and, at a given moment, troubled even to the point of not knowing how to pray! It is easy to see that in no one of our Gospels is the truly human side of Jesus' person so earnestly emphasized as in the story of the fourth. If the theme of the narrative is contained in these words: "The Word was made flesh," the predicate in this proposition is made prominent in the narrative at least as much as the subject.

But let us suppose, in spite of so many details which are foreign or contradictory to the philosophical notion of the Logos, that the intention of the author was to proclaim this new thesis and to win over the Church to it: what advantage was there for this end in introducing into the generally received narrative modifications which could only render the whole work suspicious? Why create, in some sort as a whole, a new history of our Lord's life, while it was so easy for him, as is shown by the discourse which follows the account of the multiplication of the loaves (chap. vi.), to connect his favorite theory with the facts already known and everywhere admitted.

Finally, can we, without an insurmountable psychological contradiction, hold either that the author believed his own fictions so far as to amalgamate them in one and the same narrative with the facts which were most sacred to him—those of the Passion and resurrection,—or that, not himself believing them, he presented them to his readers as real, with the purpose of strengthening and developing their faith (xx. 30, 31)? In particular, can we conceive that he founded on these miracles, invented by himself, the grand indictment which he draws up, in closing the part from v. to xii., against Jewish unbelief: "*Although he had done* so many signs before them, they believed not on him, that the word of Isaiah the prophet might be fulfilled . . ." (xii. 37, 38). And yet he who wrote thus knew perfectly that these signs, in the name of which he condemns his people, had never occurred! We reach here the limits of folly.

Thus more and more men like Weizsäcker, Hase and Renan feel themselves obliged to recognize in the fourth Gospel a real and considerable historical basis. They stop at the half-way point, no doubt; but the public consciousness will not rest there. The purely and simply historical character of the entire work will impress itself upon that consciousness, as soon as the present crisis shall have passed; and we await with confidence the moment when reparation will be made to the narrative which we have just been studying. This, as has been seen, will not be the first retractation which it will have wrested from science.

III. *The Discourses.*

But if the narrative of the facts has not been altered by reason of the speculative idea, can the same thing be affirmed of the other part—and it is the more considerable part—of our Gospel, namely, the Discourses which

it puts into the mouth of Jesus? According to the opinion of Baur, these discourses are only the evolution of the Logos idea presented in its various aspects. Reuss thinks that the author takes for his starting point certain authentic utterances of Jesus, but that he freely amplifies them, by giving them developments borrowed from his own Christian experience. In favor of this view, the glaring improbabilities are alleged, which are observed in the account given of most of these discourses; the singular conformity of thought and style between the way in which the author makes Jesus speak and the language which he ascribes to the forerunner, or his own language in the prologue and in his epistle; finally, and especially, the complete contrast in matter and form which exists between the discourses of Jesus in our Gospel and His teaching in the Synoptics.

In order to treat this important subject thoroughly, we shall study the following three questions:

1. Are the discourses of Jesus in this Gospel to be regarded as simple variations of the speculative theme which is placed by the author at the beginning of his book? Or, on the contrary, must we regard the prologue as a summing up, a quintessence, of the history and the teachings related in the following narrative?

2. Do the alleged difficulties render the historical character of the discourses inadmissible?

3. Can we rise to such a conception of the person of Jesus that the Johannean teaching shall flow from it as naturally as the Synoptic preaching?

A. *The relation of the prologue to the discourses and the narrative in general.*

Let us determine, in the first place, the true import of what is called the theorem of the Logos. It is claimed that, in thus opening his book, the author places the reader, not on the ground of history, but on that of philosophical speculation.[1] This assertion can be sustained only on one condition, that of restricting the prologue, as Reuss, and he alone, does, to the first five verses. As soon as we extend it, as the sequel forces us to do, as far as ver. 18, we see that the author's thought is not to teach that *there is* in God a Logos—in this, indeed, there would be a speculative theorem—but that this Logos, this divine being, *has appeared* in Jesus Christ—which is not a philosophical idea, but a fact, an element of history, at least as the author understood it. And in fact John the Baptist, vv. 6–9, does not testify of the existence of the Logos, but of this historical fact: that in Jesus the true divine light has been manifested. John does not say, ver. 11, that the fault of the Jews consisted in refusing to believe in the existence of a Logos, but in not receiving, as their Messiah, this divine being when he had appeared in Jesus. The blessedness of the Church (vv. 14–18) does not, according to him, flow from the fact that it has believed in the theorem of the Logos, but from the fact that it has received Him and that it possesses Him, in Jesus Christ, as the Son, the

[1] Reuss, p. 11.

source of grace and truth. The question in the prologue, therefore, is only of what Jesus is, the one whose history the author is about to relate. The tendency of this preamble is historical and religious, not metaphysical.

But more than this: the true notion of the person of Jesus is in itself only one of the essential ideas of the prologue. This passage contains two other ideas, which are no less important, and which belong still more manifestly to history. They are that of the rejection of Jesus by the Jews (ver. 11): "He came to his own, and his own received him not"—unbelief, with its consequence, perdition,—and that of the faith of the Church (ver. 16): "And of his fullness have we all received, grace upon grace"—the happiness and salvation of all believers, Jews and Gentiles. These two ideas are not metaphysical notions; they are, no less than the appearance of Christ, real facts, which the author had seen accomplished under his own eyes, and which he proposed to himself to trace out in his history. He contemplated them as realized, at the very moment when he was writing, so soon as he cast a glance on the world which surrounded him. Let us not be told, then, of "abstract formulas placed at the beginning of this book, as a kind of programme!"[1] It is the essence of the history itself which he is about to trace out, that the author sums up by way of anticipation in this preamble.

There is, to his view, such a correlation between the Gospel history which is to follow and the prologue, that the course of the latter has exactly determined the plan of the former. The narrative presents to us three facts which are developed simultaneously: the growing revelation of Jesus as the Christ and the Son of God (xx. 30, 31); the refusal of the Jewish nation, as such, to accept this revelation; and the faith of a certain number of individuals in these testimonies, consisting in acts and words. This course of the history is found again exactly in that of the prologue: vv. 1–5, the Logos; vv. 6–11, the Logos rejected; vv. 12–18, the Logos received. Now, who could hesitate for an instant as to the question whether the history was invented according to this plan, or whether this plan was conceived and traced out according to the history?

Let us remark, also, that the discourses of Jesus were one of the most important factors in the development of the history. What in a war the successive battles are which bring final victory or defeat, this same thing in the ministry of Jesus were those solemn encounters in which the Lord bore testimony of the work which God had just accomplished through Him, or in which there was formed in the people, on one side, that aversion and hatred, on the other, that sympathy and devotion which decided the result of His coming. If it is so, how could the discourses of Jesus which are related by the author be to his view only free theological compositions? Truly as the double result indicated by the prologue, the rejection by Israel and the foundation of the Church, are real facts, so truly must the discourses of Jesus, which so powerfully contributed to lead the history to this two-fold end, be facts no less real to his view.

[1] Reuss, p. 11.

Finally, there is a quite singular and often noticed fact, which is absolutely opposed to the view that the discourses of Jesus in our Gospel are to be regarded as the developments of a speculative theory peculiar to the author; it is that the term Logos, or *Word*, which characterizes the prologue so strikingly, does not in a single instance figure, as taken in the same sense, in the discourses of Jesus. The expression *word of God* is frequently employed in them to designate the contents of the divine revelation. There was only one step more to be taken in order to apply this term to the revealer himself, as in the prologue. The author has not yielded to this temptation. He might have had, more than once, occasion to make Jesus speak thus, particularly in the conversation of x. 33 ff. The Jews accuse the Lord of blaspheming, because, being a man, He makes Himself God. He replies to them that, in the Old Testament itself, the theocratic judges receive the title of *gods;* comp. Ps. lxxii. 6: "I have said, ye are gods." It was in these terms that the Psalmist addressed himself to the members of the Israelitish tribunal, as organs of the divine justice here below. From these words Jesus draws the following argument: If the Scripture, which cannot blaspheme, calls men *to whom the word of God is addressed* gods, how say you that I blaspheme, I . . ., we almost infallibly expect here: I who am the Word itself. But no; the sentence closes with these words:—"I whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world." The author does not yield, then, to any theological allurement; he remains within the limits of the Lord's own language.

Other facts still attest the fidelity with which he can confine himself to his role as historian even in that which concerns the discourse-portion of his work. He had, in his prologue, attributed to the Logos the part of divine agent in the work of creation. He had done this, starting from the testimonies of Jesus respecting His pre-existence and completing them by the narrative of Genesis, and especially by that striking expression: "*Let us make* man in *our* image" (comp. also Gen. iii. 22). Nevertheless, he had not heard this notion of the creative Logos coming forth expressly from the lips of Jesus; therefore he does not bring it into any of His discourses. And yet it might very naturally have presented itself to him, as he wrote, on more than one occasion. Thus, when Jesus prays, saying: "Restore to me the glory which I had with thee before the world was made." How easy would it have been to substitute for these last words the following: Before I made the world, or: Before thou madest the world by me. In the prologue, the Logos is also presented as the illuminator of humanity during the ages previous to His coming (vv. 5, 9, 10). This idea, once expressed by the evangelist, has played a great part in theology since the earliest ages of Christianity. The author does not bring it out anywhere in the discourses of Jesus. And yet, in such a passage as x. 16, where Jesus declares that He has also *other sheep* which are not of this (Jewish) fold, and that He will ere long bring them, or in the discourse of chap. vi., where He several times expresses the idea, that there is needed a divine preliminary *teaching* and *drawing* in order to believe in Him, how

natural it would have been to recur to the idea of the illumination of the human soul by the educating light of the Logos! No, surely, he who made Jesus say: "I say nothing except what my Father teaches me," did not allow himself to make Him speak after his own fancy. As he himself declares, 1 Ep. i. 1: "That which he announces to his brethren is only that which he has seen and *heard*." Far from the discourses of Jesus being only the development of a theorem placed at the beginning of the book, the prologue is to the entire work only that which the argument placed at the head of a chapter, and drawn from the contents of it, is to the chapter of a book of history. It is a forcible synthesis, freely formulated, of the history and teachings related in the work itself.

We should find a confirmation of this result in a fact frequently pointed out by Reuss, if this fact were as fully proved to our view as it is to his. According to this critic, we often meet in the Lord's discourses expressions which tend to establish a doctrine directly contrary to the speculative theory of the prologue. This doctrine is that of the subordination of Jesus in relation to God, which, it is urged, is contradictory to the notion of the perfect divinity of the Son, so clearly taught in the prologue. Reuss thinks that he finds in this very contradiction the proof of the fidelity with which the teachings of Jesus, on certain points, have been preserved by our evangelist, in spite of his own theology. But, for ourselves, we shall carefully refrain from using this argument, which rests on a completely false interpretation of the data of the prologue. For it is easy to prove that the subordination of the Logos to the Father is taught in this section, as well as in all the rest of the Gospel.

Before leaving this subject, let us bring forward a strange observation of the same writer. The question is as to the words of John xvii. 3. The distinction between *Jesus Christ* and *the only true God* is there very strongly emphasized—a fact which, according to Reuss, is also contradictory to the teaching of the prologue respecting the divinity of the Saviour. This judgment on his part would have nothing surprising in it, if, in his view, those words had been really uttered by Jesus; they would come into the category of those of which we have just spoken. But no; according to this critic, these words are invented by the author, as well as those of the prologue. The evangelist, then, would ascribe to Jesus, in this case, words contradictory to his own theology! We have been assured up to this point, that he freely composed the discourses in order to put *his* theology into them, and lo, now, he makes Jesus speak in order to combat Himself. In what a labyrinth of contradictions poor criticism here loses itself!

B. *The difficulties alleged against the historical character of the discourses.*

There is a very prevalent opinion, at the present day, that Jesus could not have spoken as our evangelist makes Him speak. Renan regards the Johannean discourses as "pieces of theology and rhetoric to which we must not ascribe historical reality, any more than to the discourses which Plato puts into the mouth of his master at the moment of dying."

1. This opinion is, first of all, founded on the *improbabilities inherent in the discourses themselves.*

The argument is, first, from the *obscurity* of the teachings. It would have been a strange want of pedagogic wisdom on Jesus' part to teach in a way so little intelligible. "One would say that Jesus is anxious to speak in enigmas, to soar always in the higher regions inaccessible to the understanding of the common people." By such a mode of teaching He would never have "won hearts given birth to that enthusiastic faith which survived the catastrophe of Golgotha."[1] Assuredly not, if He had always spoken in this way, never otherwise. But our Gospel does not claim to be any more complete with regard to teachings, than with regard to facts. We have proved this: this work traces out only a score of occasions selected from a ministry of two years and a half. There were days—and they were the largest number—when Jesus led His hearers on the lower or middle slopes of the mountain which He wished to make humanity climb; but there were others when He sought to bring them near to the lofty summits and to give them a glimpse of their sublime beauties. Without the discourses of the first sort, no bond would have been formed between their souls and His own. Without those of the second, He would not have raised the Church to the height from which it was to conquer and rule the world. It is these last discourses which the fourth evangelist has especially reproduced, because this higher element of the Saviour's teaching had not found a sufficient place in the primitive tradition intended for popular evangelization. We can understand, indeed, that the life-like and brilliant parables, the very forcible moral maxims, and all the elements of this sort, would rather have supplied the material for the catechetical instruction of the earliest times, and that the teachings of a more elevated nature would have remained in the background in it, without, however, as we shall see, being altogether wanting.

With this first charge is connected that of a certain *monotony*. At bottom, there is in the whole Gospel, according to Sabatier, "only a single discourse;" Reuss would, indeed, find two of them. According to the first of these writers, it is throughout this same idea: "I am the way, the truth, the life." According to the second, this theme is developed, sometimes with regard to the unregenerate world, sometimes with regard to those who already belong to Jesus Christ.[2]

Do the facts, when seriously questioned, confirm this estimate? On the contrary, has not every discourse in this Gospel its originality, its particular point of view, as much as the teachings contained in the Synoptics? When Jesus reveals to Nicodemus the *spiritual nature* of the kingdom of God, in opposition to the earthly idea which the Pharisees formed of it; when He teaches the Samaritan woman the *universality* of the worship which He comes to inaugurate on the earth, in opposition to the local character of the ancient worships; when, at Jerusalem, He unfolds the mystery of the *community of action* between the Father and

[1] Reuss, *Théologie johannique*, p. 51.

[2] Sabatier, p. 185; Reuss, p. 28.

the Son, as well as the total dependence of the latter; when, at Capernaum, He sets forth His *relation to the lost world*, and offers Himself to His hearers as the bread from heaven which brings the life of God to mankind; when, in chap. x., He reveals to the people of Jerusalem the formation of the *new flock* which He is about to take out of the old one, and which He will fill up by the sheep brought from all the other folds; when, on the last evening, He announces to His disciples the commission which He entrusts to them of supplying His place on earth by *doing works greater* than His own; then, when He describes to them the *hatred of the world* of which they will be the objects, and when, finally, before saying a last farewell to them, and commending them to the Father in prayer, He promises the *new Helper*, by means of whom they will convince the world of sin, of righteousness and of judgment, and will obtain in His name a complete victory—can this be the teaching always of the same thing? Is there not some partisan interest in this judgment? There is monotony, if you will, in the light of the sun; but what variety in its reflections! There is the same in the boundless azure of the sky; but what richness in its contrasts with the varied lines of the earthly horizon! At the foundation of every Johannean discourse there is an open heaven, the heart of the Son in communion with that of the Father. But this living, personal heaven is in constant relation to the infinitely different individuals who surround it, and to the changing situations through which it moves along its life. The monotony which is charged upon the evangelist, is not that of uniformity, but of unity.

Offense is taken at the same monotony in the *method* employed by the evangelist to introduce the exposition of his theology. He regularly begins, by means of a figurative expression which he ascribes to Jesus, with making the hearer fall into a gross and absurd misapprehension; whereupon Jesus develops His thought and displays His superiority, and that, ordinarily, by pushing His thought even to the extreme of contradiction to that of His interlocutor. This is the fact in the case of Nicodemus, and in that of the Samaritan woman, in the case of the people after the multiplication of the loaves, and, finally, in the conflicts at Jerusalem. There is here a manner adopted by the author, and one which cannot, it is said, belong to the history. But if the people who surrounded Jesus were carnal in their aspirations, they must have been so also in their understanding; for in the moral domain it is from the heart that both light and darkness proceed; Jesus Himself says this, Matt. vi. 22. What then more natural than the constant repetition of this shock at every encounter between the thought of Jesus and that of His contemporaries? On one side, immediate intuition of things above; on the other, the grossest fleshly want of understanding. What point of spiritual development had the apostles reached, according to the Synoptics themselves, after two whole years, during which Jesus had sought, in the conversations of every day, to initiate them into a new view of things? He gives them this admonition: "Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees;" and they imagine that He means to reproach

them with the forgetfulness into which they had fallen in respect to providing themselves with bread for their proposed journey! Jesus is obliged to say to them: "Have you no understanding, have you your heart still hardened, eyes not to see, and ears not to hear?" (Mark viii. 17, 18.) And yet the critic would declare a similar misunderstanding impossible in the case of Nicodemus, of the Samaritan woman, of His hearers in Galilee or in Jerusalem, who conversed with Him for the first time. And, moreover, it must not be forgotten that the thought of Nicodemus is simply this: "It is not, however, possible that . . . "—this is what the μή (negative interrogation), which begins his question, signifies; and that in other cases, such as John vii. 35 and viii. 22, the apparent misapprehension of the Jews is, in reality, only derisive bantering on their part. As to the misapprehension of the people of Capernaum, John vi., many others were deceived here, even afterwards, in spite of the explanation of Jesus, ver. 63: "It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing." The phenomenon which is marked as suspicious is, therefore, simply a feature drawn from fact.

The same is true of the *dialogue-form* in which many of the teachings of Jesus are presented, especially in chaps. vii. and viii. and in chap. xiv. How could such minute details have been preserved, either in the individual recollection of the author, or traditionally? "These questions and objections," it is said, "do not belong to the history, but to the form of the redaction." They wonderfully depict the state of men's minds, as the *author* found it before him when he wrote, but by no means as it was when Jesus was preaching.[1] But are we then so exactly acquainted with the difference which the state of men's minds may have presented at the beginning of the second century or about the middle of the first? And how can it be seriously maintained that the questions and objections which follow suit better the state of mind in Asia Minor at the beginning of the second century, than the Palestinian prejudices in the time of Jesus? "Doth the Christ, then, come out of Galilee . . .? Doth he not come from Bethlehem, the village where David was?" (vii. 41, 42.) "We know whence this man is; but when the Christ shall come, no one will know whence he is" (ver. 27). "Are we not right in saying that thou art a Samaritan?" (viii. 48.) "Art thou, then, greater than our father Abraham?" (ver. 53.) "We are Abraham's seed, and have never been in bondage to any one" (ver. 33). "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" (vi. 52.) "Is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? How then doth he say: I came down from heaven?" (ver. 42.) If one desires to find a speaking proof of the truly historical character of the teaching of Jesus in our Gospel, it is precisely in these dialogues that it must be sought. To open a commentary is enough to convince us that we have here living manifestations of the Palestinian Judaism which was contemporary with Jesus. Besides, this dialogue-form is not constant; barely indicated in chaps. iii., iv., a little more developed in

[1] Reuss, *Théol. joh.*, p. 9.

chap. vi., it is altogether dominant in chaps. vii., viii.—a thing which is perfectly suited to the situation, since here is the culminating point of the conflict between the Lord and His adversaries at Jerusalem. We find scarcely any traces of it in chap. x., where Jesus begins to withdraw from the struggle. It reappears in an emphatic way only in chap. xiv., where it is again rendered natural by the situation. It is the last moment of conversation between Jesus and His own; they take advantage of it to express freely the doubts which each one of them still has in his heart. Let one picture to himself a Christian of the second century crying out, with the simplicity of Philip: "Lord, show us the Father and it sufficeth us!" or, with the pretence of sharing in the ignorance of Thomas, setting himself to say: "We know not whither thou goest, and how shall we know the way?" or asking with Judas: "Why wilt thou make thyself known to us, and not to the world?" or murmuring aside like the disciples (xvi. 17): "What is this that he saith: A little while, and ye shall not see me; and again a little while, and ye shall see me? We cannot tell what he saith." The situation which gave rise to these questions and these doubts existed but for a moment, on that last evening in which John's narrative places them. From the days which followed all these mysteries had received their solution through the great facts of salvation which were from this time forward accomplished. These objections and questions, which it is claimed are to be placed in the second century, carry therefore their date in themselves and belong in their very nature to the upper chamber; it is, consequently, the same with the answers which correspond to them.

Certain *historical contradictions* are also alleged. The following are the two principal ones. Chap. x. 26, in the account of the visit of Jesus at the feast of the Dedication, in December, the evangelist places in His mouth this reproach: "Ye are not of my sheep, *as I said unto you*," which is supposed to be a quotation of the words addressed to the Jews, some months before, at the feast of Tabernacles (comp. the allegories of the Shepherd, the Door, and the Good Shepherd, in the first part of the same chapter). He forgets, therefore, as he makes Jesus speak thus, that the audience had entirely changed from the one feast to the other. But why changed? we will ask. It was not to pilgrims who were strangers, that Jesus had spoken so severely some months before. It was to a group of Pharisees who asked Him, mocking, (ix. 40): "And are we also blind?" They spoke thus in the name of their whole party, and this party, we know, had its seat at Jerusalem. I do not say certainly that at the feast of the Dedication it was the same *individuals* who found themselves again face to face with Jesus; but it was indeed the same class of persons, the Pharisees of Jerusalem, together with the population of that city which was entirely governed by their spirit. Besides, every one knows that the words: *as I said unto you*, on which all the complaint rests, are omitted in six of the principal majuscules, particularly in the *Sinaitic* and *Vatican*.

Another similar argument is drawn from the discourse of Jesus, reported in xii. 44 ff. It is "a recapitulation of the evangelical theology," says

Reuss; and the author puts it into the mouth of Jesus here, without thinking that, according to his own narrative, Jesus has just "withdrawn and disappeared from the public view." Here is a fact, adds this critic, which is well fitted "to give us a just idea of the nature of the discourses of Jesus" in this work.[1] Baur had already concluded from this passage that the historical situations are for the author nothing but mere forms. It is not the evangelist's fault if his narrative is thus judged. He had counted on readers who would not doubt his common sense. He had just expressly concluded the narrative of the public ministry of Jesus by this solemn sentence: "And departing, he did hide himself from them" (ver. 36). And yet he is said to put into His mouth, immediately afterwards, a solemn address to the people! No; from ver. 37 the author has himself begun to speak; he gives himself up to the sorrowful contemplation of the unsuccessfulness of such an extraordinary ministry. He proves by the facts the inefficacy of the numerous miracles of Jesus to overcome the unbelief of the people (vv. 37–43). Then, in ver. 44, he passes, in this same recapitulation, from the miracles to the teachings, which, as well as the miracles, had remained inefficacious before such obduracy; and in order to give an understanding of what the entire preaching ministry accomplished by Jesus in Israel had been, he sums it up in the discourse, vv. 44–50, which is, in relation to the discourses of Jesus, what ver. 37 was to His miraculous activity, a simple summary: "And yet he cried aloud!" Then follows the summary, thus announced, of all the solemn testimonies which had remained fruitless. This passage, also, is distinguished from all the real discourses, in that it does not contain *a single* new idea; for every word, two or three parallels can be cited in the preceding discourses. Reuss, therefore, is unfortunate in proposing to draw from this discourse, which is not one in the intention of the evangelist himself, the true standard for the estimate of all those which, in this work, are put into the mouth of our Lord.

Finally, objection has also been made to the truth of the discourses by reason of the impossibility that the author should have retained them in memory up to the time, no doubt quite late in his life, when he wrote them out. Reuss abandons this objection. He thinks that the words of Jesus, so far as the author either heard them himself or borrowed them from the tradition, "must have been throughout his life the subject of his meditations, and must have been impressed the more deeply on his mind the longer he fed upon them."[2] In fact, if the question is of the earnest discussions carried on at Jerusalem (chaps. vii. viii.), how should they not have been distinctly impressed on the memory of the one who witnessed them with such lively anxiety? As for the discourses which are somewhat extended, like those of chap. v. and vi., x., xv.–xvii., the hearer's memory found, in every case, a point of support in a central idea which was clearly formulated at the beginning, and which unfolded itself afterwards in a series of particular notions subordinated to this primal idea.

[1] P. 50. [2] P. 44.

Thus in chap. v., the first part of the apologetic discourse of Jesus is contained, as if in its germ, in that very striking saying of ver. 17: "My Father worketh hitherto, and [consequently] I also work." This idea of the necessary co-operation of the Son with His Father is developed in a first cycle under two aspects: The Son beholding the Father, and the Father revealing His work to the Son, vv. 19, 20. Then, this first cycle, which is also very summary in its character, becomes the starting-point of a new, more precise development, in which is unfolded, even to its most concrete applications, the work of the Son in execution of the thought of the Father. This work consists in the two divine acts of *quickening* and *judging* (vv. 21–23), acts which are taken up each one of them successively, and followed out through all their historical phases even to their complete realization, at first spiritual, then external and material (vv. 24–29).—It is nearly the same in the second part of this discourse (vv. 30–47), in which everything is subordinated to this principal thought: "There is another [the Father] that beareth witness of me," and in which is set forth the three-fold testimony of the Father on behalf of the Son, with a final forcible application to the hearers.—In chap. vi., it is easy to see that everything—discourse and conversation—is likewise subordinated to a great idea,—that which naturally arises from the miracle of the preceding day: "I am the bread of life." This affirmation is developed in a series of concentric cycles, which end finally in this most striking and concrete expression: "Unless ye eat my flesh and drink my blood, ye will not have life in yourselves." In chap. xvii., in the second part of the sacerdotal prayer, which contains the intercession of Jesus for His disciples, His thought follows the same course. The general idea: "I pray for them," soon divides itself into those two more particular ones which become, each of them, the centre of a subordinate cycle: "*Keep them*" (*τήρησον*), ver. 11, that is to say: "Let not the work be impaired which I have accomplished in them," and: "*Sanctify them*" (*ἁγίασον*), ver. 17, that is to say: "Perfect and finish their consecration."—In these several cases, if the thoughts of Jesus really were unfolded in this form, which best suits the nature of religious contemplation, we can readily understand how it was not difficult for an attentive hearer to reproduce such sayings. It was enough for him to fix his attention strongly on the central thought, distinctly engraved upon his memory, and then inwardly to repeat the same process of evolution which, from this germ, had produced the discourse. He thus recovered again the subordinate ideas, from which he reached even the most concrete details. Jesus, however, did not always speak in this way; we have the proof of this in our Synoptics, and in the fourth Gospel itself. This method was natural when a theme of great richness was indicated to Him by the situation, as in chaps. v. and vi. But we do not find anything of the kind either in the conversation with Nicodemus, or in those of chap. xiv.—which proves that we need not see in this a style peculiar to the evangelist. The following is, probably, what happened in the last mentioned cases. The conversation with Nicodemus certainly continued much longer than the few moments which we use in reading

it, and the last conversations of Jesus with the disciples, having filled a great part of the evening, must have lasted some hours. It must therefore be admitted (unless all this was invented) that a work of condensation was wrought in the mind of the narrator, in which the essential thoughts gradually became separated from the secondary thoughts and transitions, and then were directly, and without a connective, joined to one another, as they actually appear to us in the account given by John. There remain for us, therefore, of these conversations only the principal points. Nothing could be more simple than this process.

The conclusion of this study, therefore, is that there is no serious intrinsic difficulty to prevent us from admitting the historical truth of the teachings of Jesus contained in our Gospel.

II. But a more serious objection is drawn from the correspondence of these discourses with those of *John the Baptist*, and with the author's own teachings *in the prologue* and *in his first epistle*.

Jesus, in St. John, speaks just as John the Baptist does (comp. i. 15, 29, 30; iii. 27–36), just as the evangelist himself does in his own writings. Is there not here an evident proof that the discourses—those of Jesus, like those of John the Baptist—are his own composition? There can be no question here of style, as to its grammatical and syntactic forms; how, indeed, is it possible that the style should not be that of the evangelist? Neither Jesus nor John the Baptist spoke in Greek; and to reproduce their discourses in a tolerable way in that language, whose genius is precisely the opposite of that of the Aramæan language, in which the Saviour and His forerunner spoke, a literal translation was impossible. The author was obliged in any case, therefore, to go underneath the words to the thoughts, and then to clothe these again with a new expression borrowed from the language in which he was relating them. In such a work of assimilation and reproduction, why might not the language of John the Baptist have taken a coloring like that of the language of Jesus, and the language of both the coloring of the evangelist's style? The question here is not of the external forms of speech; it is of the faithful preservation of the thoughts. In translating the words of John and Jesus, is it to be supposed that the author altered their meaning? Was there anything of his own added? Or did he even compose with entire freedom? It is supposed that an affirmative answer can be given. First of all, the discourse of John the Baptist, iii. 27–36, is alleged. Reuss grants, no doubt, that two expressions of this discourse proceed from the forerunner —that which forms the opening of it: "I am not the Christ," and the word which is its centre: "He must increase, but I must decrease."[1] Moreover, continues the critic, "there is not in all the remainder a word which does not find a place quite as well, or rather a hundred times better, in the mouth of a Christian wholly imbued with the dominant ideas of this book, and which is not reproduced elsewhere, as to its essence, in the discourses ascribed to Jesus Himself."[2] But what! can it be that

[1] Reuss' Translation. [2] Pp. 48, 49.

these words made up the whole of the Baptist's answer to his disciples, who were bitterly accusing Jesus of ingratitude! Let it be allowed us to believe that he developed them somewhat, and, in particular, to place in the number of the authentic expressions that word of inimitable beauty (ver. 29): "He that hath the bride is the bridegroom; the friend of the bridegroom who standeth and heareth him, rejoiceth greatly because of the bridegroom's voice; and this my joy is fulfilled." Men did not invent after this fashion in the second century, as our Apocryphal books bear witness! Let us go still further: if we admit the narrative of the Synoptics, according to which the forerunner had heard the voice of the Father saying to Jesus: "Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased," is it impossible to admit that the same man should have uttered these words, which the evangelist puts into his mouth (ver. 35): "*The Father loveth the Son*, and hath put all things into his hand?" If it is also true—still according to the Synoptics—that John saw the Holy Spirit descending upon Jesus in the form of a dove, that is, in His organic and indivisible plenitude, is it incredible that he should have expressed himself with regard to Jesus as he does, according to John, in ver. 34: "He speaketh the words of God; for *God giveth him the Spirit* without measure (or: the Spirit giveth them to him without measure)?" And if John the Baptist expresses himself at the beginning of his ministry as the Synoptics make him speak: "Brood of vipers, who hath warned you to flee *from the wrath to come?* Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is cut down and cast into the fire!" (Matt. iii. 7–10), is it not very natural that he should close his public activity with this warning: "He that refuseth to obey the Son, the wrath of God abideth on him." Here is the last echo of the thunders of Sinai, which is in its appropriate place in the mouth of the last representative of the old covenant. But the objection falls back on the saying: "He testifieth of what he hath seen and heard, and no man receiveth his testimony," and it asks how it can be that John the Baptist should so literally repeat the declaration of Jesus Himself in His conversation with Nicodemus (ver. 11): "Verily, I say unto thee, we speak that which we know and testify that which we have seen, and ye receive not our testimony." He was not present, however, at that conversation! No; but it may well be that something of it had been reported to him; and, even if it was otherwise, what meaning would the words of the Baptist have which we were just now calling to mind: "The friend of the bridegroom who standeth and heareth, rejoiceth exceedingly *because of the bridegroom's voice;* and *this my joy* is fulfilled?" He hears the voice of the bridegroom! Some word of Jesus, then, has come to his ears. And is it not natural indeed, that, while John and Jesus were baptizing in each other's neighborhood (vv. 22, 23), those of the apostles who had been disciples of the forerunner should have taken a few steps to go and salute their former master, and should have reported to him what Jesus did and said? The discourse of John the Baptist is thus explained from beginning to end. And the word to which Reuss reduced it, ver. 30, was simply its central idea. Indeed, all that precedes (vv. 27–29), is the development of

the second proposition: "I must decrease," and all that follows, vv. 31–36, is that of the first: "He must increase."

But is it possible to regard as historical the words put into the mouth of John the Baptist in the prologue, i. 15, and repeated afterwards in the narrative itself, i. 30: "He who cometh after me was before me?" Could John know and declare the divine pre-existence of Jesus? If this declaration had been mentioned only in the prologue, which is the composition of the evangelist, the doubt would be possible. But the author expressly places it again, at a little later point, in its historical context (ver. 30). He relates how it was at Bethany that the forerunner uttered it, on the day which followed that of the deputation of the Sanhedrim. There would be a singular affectation, not to say, palpable bad faith, in these subsidiary indications of time and place, if the words were the invention of the author. Besides they have a seal of originality and of mysterious conciseness which is foreign to the later fictions. And why should they not be authentic? When John the Baptist began his ministry, we know that the programme of his work was the double prophecy of Isaiah xl. 3: "A voice crying in the wilderness: Prepare ye the way of the Lord," and of Malachi iii. i: "Behold, I send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me" (Matt. iii. 3; x. 10; Mark i. 2, 3; Luke i. 17; vii. 27). Now, in the second of these two passages, always so closely bound together, He who *sends* the messenger (Jehovah) is none other than He who is Himself soon to *follow* him (Jehovah as Messiah); this is unanswerably proved by the words, *before me*, in the prophetic utterance. If John the Baptist was acquainted with this passage, could he not understand—what do I say?—could he fail to understand, that the one *coming after* him (the Messiah) was the one *sending* him, and consequently his *predecessor* on the scene of history, the invisible theocratic King. The question comes back, then, to this: Did John the Baptist know how to read?

The resemblance in matter and form between the *prologue* and the discourses of Jesus does not constitute a difficulty which is any more serious. For, on the one hand, we have seen that the matter of the teachings of the prologue is, in great part, only a résumé of these very discourses; and, on the other, it is impossible that, in translating them from Aramaic into Greek, the author should not, in a certain measure, have clothed them in his own style. The conformity indicated is, therefore, a fact which is easily explained.

Is the conformity between the discourses and *the first Epistle* to be considered more compromising for the authenticity of the former? As to the form, the resemblance is explained by the causes already pointed out, when speaking of the prologue. But even from this external point of view, H. Meyer has discovered a kind of impoverishment in the vocabulary of the epistle, as compared with that of the discourses.[1] Some thirty substantives, some twenty verbs—this is the whole linguistic fund of the epistle. What

[1] *Les discours du IV.e évangile*, p. 94.

a difference from the discourses, so rich in living and original words, and in striking and varied images! There are also, on the other hand, certain particular expressions which appertain to the epistle and which are foreign to the Gospel, such as *to be born of God* (ii. 29; iii. 9; iv. 7; v. 1; comp. the prologue, Gosp. i. 13); the *anointing* of the Spirit (ii. 20, 27); the title of *Paraclete* applied to Jesus (ii. 1).

As to the matter, we discover even much more remarkable differences between the epistle and the Gospel, which prove that the author observed very carefully the line of demarcation between his own thoughts and the teachings of Jesus. We shall set forth three points, especially, which hold an important place in the epistle, and which are not mentioned anywhere in the discourses: 1. The expiatory value of the Lord's death (Ep. i. 7, 9; ii. 2; iv. 10; v. 6); 2. The coming of Antichrist (ii. 18, 22; iv. 1–3); 3. The expectation of the Parousia (i. 18, 28; iii. 2). These three notions, while connecting our epistle closely with the Synoptic Gospels, distinguish it profoundly from the Johannean discourses. The attempt has been, not long since, made to explain this difference by ascribing the epistle to another author than the Gospel. This hypothesis has not been able to maintain itself, even in the midst of the school in which it arose. The disciples of Baur, such as Hilgenfeld, Lüdemann, etc., are agreed in rejecting it. How then can we explain this singular difference? Several critics have been led to think that the author of the two works was still imbued with his old Jewish ideas when he composed the epistle, and that he rose only at a later time to the sublime spirituality which distinguishes the Gospel.[1] The epistle would, thus, be older than the Gospel. We do not believe that this hypothesis can be sustained. The discourses contained in the Gospel are distinguished from the teachings of the epistle by a force of thought and a vigor of expression, which indicate for them a date anterior to the composition of this latter work. Besides, the man who, in the epistle, addresses himself not only to *the children* and *young men*, but also to *fathers* of families and to all the members of the churches, calling them "my little children" (ii. 1, 18, 28; v. 21), cannot have been otherwise than far advanced in age. It is not under such conditions that a man rises from the style of the epistle to that of the Gospel, from the somewhat slow and even hesitating step of the one to the straightforward and powerful flight of the other.[2] A further proof that the composition of the discourses preceded that of the epistle, is the fact that all the ideas which in the discourses are presented in a form which is historical, occasional, actual, applicable to particular circumstances and hearers, reappear in the epistle in an abstract form as general Christian maxims, and, in some sort, as the elements of a religious philosophy. Jesus said in the Gospel: "God so loved the world," or "Thou didst love me before the foundation of the world." The epistle says: "God is love." Jesus said: "The Father whose offspring you are is

[1] Hilgenfeld, *Einleitung*, p. 738; Lüdemann, *zur Erklärung des Papias-Fragments*, in the *Jahrb. für prot. Theol.*, 1879.

[2] Sabatier himself acknowledges (p. 189) that the epistle is poorer, more feeble than the discourses in the Gospel.

the devil, and you do the works of your father." The epistle says: "He that commits sin is of the devil." Jesus said: "You have not chosen me, but I have chosen you." The epistle says: "It is not we who have loved God; it is He who has loved us." Jesus said: "I am the light of the world; he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness." The epistle says: "God is light . . . the true light now shineth." Jesus said: "I have a witness greater than that of men." The epistle says: "If we receive the witness of men, that of God is greater." Is it not evident that these aphorisms of the second work are nothing but the generalization of the special affirmations, full of reality, which belong to the first? The Gospel is history; the epistle is the spirit of history. It is consequently contrary to all sound criticism to place the latter before the former.

The difference between these two works must, therefore, be explained in another way. It is an indisputable fact that the ideas which we have pointed out as clearly distinguishing the epistle from the Gospel, appertain to the Synoptic teaching, and consequently form a part of the apostolic beliefs and of the doctrine of the Church in general. Here, then, was the matter from which the author drew when writing the epistle. But when he wrote out the five or six discourses which he has preserved for us, he did not allow himself to go beyond their original purport, nor to introduce into them, as Reuss claims, *the whole* of his theology. He limited himself to that which he had *heard* on those particular occasions. The epistle forms thus a natural link of connection between the Johannean teachings and those of the Synoptics. And the more closely it attaches itself to the latter in the substance of the ideas, the more does it become a confirmation of the historical character both of the one and the other.

Far then from giving us grounds of suspicion, the comparison of the discourses with the author's own compositions is converted into a proof of the fidelity with which he has reproduced the former, and the author seems nowhere to have crossed the line of demarcation between what he had heard and what he himself composed.

III. We here reach the most difficult side of the question with which we have to do. We possess in the first three Gospels three documents, perfectly harmonious and of undisputed value, containing the teachings of Jesus. These teachings appear therein in a simple, popular, practical form; they are what they must have been in order to charm the multitudes and win their assent. How could the abstruse and theological discourses of the fourth Gospel have proceeded from the same mind and the same lips? "We must choose," says Renan: "if Jesus spoke as Matthew would have Him, He could not have spoken as John would have Him." "Now," he adds, "between the two authorities no critic has hesitated, or will hesitate."

Is the contrast thus indicated really as inexplicable as is asserted? It is to the study of this question that we are going to devote the following pages.

As to the *contents* of the teachings, three points, especially, appear to distinguish the discourses of John from those of the Synoptics: 1. The

difference in the part assigned to the person of Jesus in the matter of salvation; 2. The Johannean notion of the existence of Jesus, as a divine being, anterior to His earthly life; 3. The omission in John of every expression relating to His visible return, as judge of the world.

With regard to the part of Jesus in the matter of salvation, it is alleged that, while the Christ of the Synoptics simply announces the kingdom of God—the *good tidings* of the near coming of that glorious state of things,—the Christ of John can only preach Himself, and tell what He is as related to God and what He is as related to the world. While the Synoptic teachings bear upon the most varied moral obligations, beneficence, humility, veracity, detachment from the world, watchfulness, prayer—in a word, upon *the righteousness of the kingdom*, according to the expression of Jesus Himself,—in John, on the contrary, every duty is reduced to the attaching of oneself to that being come from heaven, in whom God reveals and gives Himself. In the Synoptics, Jesus is the preacher of salvation; in John, He is salvation itself, eternal life, everything.

Is the difference thus pointed out as considerable as it is said to be, and is the contrast inexplicable? No, this cannot be; for the *central* position which the person of Christ occupies in the Johannean teaching is also decidedly ascribed to Him in that of the first three Gospels. The moral precepts which Jesus gives in the latter are placed in intimate relation with His own person; and among the duties of human life, that which takes precedence of all the rest is, in them as in John, faith in Christ the indispensable condition of salvation. Let the reader judge for himself.

"Sell that thou hast and give to the poor . . . , then *follow me*," says Jesus to the rich young man (Matt. xix. 21). The second of these commands explains the first; the one is the condition, the other the end. "Verily I say unto you that, inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of these my brethren, ye have done it unto *me*" (Matt. xxv. 40). It is the sympathy for *Him*, Jesus, which constitutes the worth of this help, and which is, if we may so speak, the good work in the good work (comp. x. 42). Jesus adds (xxv. 41), as He turns towards the condemned: "Depart *from me*, ye cursed!" Perdition is the rupture of all union with *Him*. To receive *Him* is to receive God, He declares to His disciples (Matt. x. 40). The most indisputable proof that one possesses the humble disposition which is necessary in order to enter into the kingdom, is that of receiving a child *in the name of Jesus;* that is, as if one were receiving Jesus Himself; and the offense which will infallibly destroy him who has the unhappiness to occasion it, is this—that it is caused to *one of these little ones who believe in Him* (Matt. xviii. 5, 6); so true is it that the good in the good is love for *Him*, and the crime in the crime is the evil which one does to *Him*. The infallibly efficacious prayer is that of two or three persons praying *in His name* (Matt. xviii. 20). Real watchfulness consists in waiting for *Him*, the returning Lord, and the condition of the entrance with Him into His glory is the being ready to receive *Him* at His coming (Luke xii. 36). If the foolish virgins are rejected, it is for not having fulfilled their duty towards *Him* (Matt. xxv. 12). To confess *Him* here below is the way to be ac-

knowledged by Him above, as also to deny *Him* is to pronounce one's own sentence (Matt. x. 32, 33; Mark viii. 38). The most intimate and sacred relations of human life must remain constantly subordinated to the bond which unites the believer to Jesus, so that the believer must be ready to break them, "to hate father, mother, child, wife, his own life," if the supreme bond requires this sacrifice (Matt. x. 37). Otherwise one would not be *worthy of Him*, which is equivalent to *being ranked among the workers of iniquity*, and being excluded with them (Matt. vii. 23; xxv. 12). Not to have turned to account the gifts entrusted by Him for working in *His cause*, for increasing *His* wealth here below,—to have been *His* unprofitable servant,—this is enough to cause one to be cast into the *outer darkness*, where there are only weeping and gnashing of teeth (Matt. xxv. 30). The most decisive act of the moral life, the indispensable condition to being able to *find* one's life again in the future,—to give oneself, to *lose* oneself—this act can be accomplished only *for His sake* (Matt. x. 39). Could Jesus describe otherwise the relation of man to God Himself?

There is one fact in the Gospel history omitted by John, but preserved by the three Synoptics, which shows, more clearly than all the sayings can do, how Jesus really made the whole religious and moral life of His own consist in personal union with Himself. It is the institution of the Holy Supper, together with those two declarations which explain it: "This is my blood which is shed for many for the remission of sins;" and, "The Son of Man came to give His life a ransom for many" (Matt. xxvi. 28; xx. 28). To incorporate Jesus into oneself, is to appropriate life to oneself. Jesus is not only the preacher of salvation; He is also, as in John, salvation itself. The part of Jesus in the matter of salvation, therefore, does not fundamentally differ in the two teachings; and so the Church has never experimentally felt the contrast indicated. Herein only, as it seems to me, is the difference and its origin. The Synoptics, with a partiality for them—we have seen the reason of this—traced out the popular and daily preachings of Jesus, in which He sought to awaken the moral life of His hearers and to stimulate the spiritual instincts which alone could lead them to Him. Now, these hearers were Jews, brought up from infancy in the expectation of the Messianic Kingdom. Jesus, like John the Baptist, takes, therefore, this glorious hope for the starting-point of His teaching, while endeavoring to spiritualize it and to set forth holiness as the essential characteristic of that future state of things. With this purpose, He emphasizes forcibly the moral qualities which its members must possess. But this was only the propaedeutic and elementary teaching, the general basis (which was common to Him with the law and the prophets) of the special and truly new preaching which He brought to the world. This preaching had reference to the part played by His person in the work of salvation and in the establishment of the kingdom. And when He comes to this subject in the Synoptics, He insists, no less than in the fourth Gospel, on the vital importance of faith in Him, and on the concentration of salvation in His person and work. Without the first form of teaching, He would have found His hearers only deaf. Without the second, He would never have

carried them on to the point to which He desired to raise them. While describing to us particularly the first, the Synoptics have nevertheless faithfully preserved the second; and it is in this that we especially discover, as we have just now done, the common matter, as between them and John.

But there is a point on which the fourth Gospel seems to pass decidedly beyond the contents of the Synoptic teaching. It is that of the *divine pre-existence* of Jesus. Must we recognize here an idea imported by the author of the fourth Gospel into the Lord's teaching, or should we regard this notion as a real element in the testimony of Jesus respecting Himself?

Three sayings, in the Gospel of John, in particular, evidently contain this notion: "What will happen when you shall see the Son of man ascending up *where he was before*" (vi. 62). "Verily, verily, I say unto you, *Before* Abraham was, I *am*" (viii. 58). "And now, Father, glorify thou me with thyself, with the glory *which I had with thee* before the world was" (xvii. 5); or indeed, as Jesus says in ver. 24, "because thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world." Beyschlag, Weizsäcker, Ritschl, and others attempt to give to this pre-existence only an ideal sense: Jesus felt and recognized Himself as the man whom God had from eternity foreseen, loved, chosen, and destined to be the Saviour of mankind, and the feeling of this eternal predestination formulated itself in Him as the consciousness of His personal pre-existence. But this attempt at explanation stops far short of the meaning of the words which we have just quoted. "Where *He* was before" can only designate an existence as real, as personal, as the present existence of Him who thus speaks. And in the other two declarations, the comparison with Abraham ("before Abraham was," literally, *became*, *γενέσθαι*), and with the world ("before the world was"), two perfectly real beings, does not allow us to ascribe to Him who is compared with them, in the point of precedence, a less real existence than theirs. The sole question, consequently, is whether Jesus *Himself* spoke in this way, or whether some other person attributed to Him such assertions.

Let us, first of all, recall to mind the fact that the idea of the divinity of the Messiah was one of the fundamental points of the doctrine of the prophets. Only an exegesis thoroughly determined not to bow before the texts can deny this. If the critics will have it so, we will not insist upon the second Psalm, although, according to our conviction, the words: "Thou art my Son," and these: "Kiss the Son," cannot denote anything else than the participation of the Messiah in the divine existence, and the obligation on the part of men to worship Him. But what cannot be denied is the titles of *Mighty God* and *Eternal Father* which Isaiah gives to "the child who is born to us" (ix. 5); the contrast which Micah institutes (v. 2) between the earthly birth of the ruler of Israel, at *Bethlehem*, and His higher origin which is *from eternity;* the identification, in Zechariah, of Jehovah with the suffering Messiah, in that expression which is tortured in vain: "They shall look on *me* whom they have *pierced*" (xii. 10);

finally and above all, that promise which Malachi puts in the mouth—of whom? of Jehovah or of the Messiah? evidently of both, since it identifies them, as we have already seen: "Behold, *I send* my messenger (the forerunner), and he shall prepare the way *before me*, and the Lord whom ye seek, *the angel of the covenant* whom ye desire, shall suddenly enter into *his* temple; behold, he cometh, saith the Lord of hosts" (iii. 1). The coming of the Messiah is the coming of the Lord, of *Adonai*, a name which is given only to God; it is the coming of the *angel of the covenant*, of that angel of the Lord of whom the Pentateuch speaks many times, and whom Isaiah calls "the angel of his presence" (lxiii. 9), of that mysterious being in whom the Lord appears, ever since the earliest times, when He wishes to manifest Himself in a manner apprehensible to the senses, and of whom God says (Num. xxiii. 21): "*My name* (my manifested essence) is in Him." It is this mysterious being who, in these words of Malachi—which may be called the culminating point of Messianic prophecy—declares Himself to be at once the Messiah who is to follow the forerunner and the God who sends Him, and who is worshiped at Jerusalem. And let it not be said that we put into this passage things which are not in it, or which, at least, were not yet seen in it in the time of Jesus. We have already had the proof of the contrary. That saying of John the Baptist: "He who cometh after me was before me," was derived by him from this source through the illumination of the Spirit. But we possess yet another proof—it is the words which Luke puts into the mouth of the angel, when he announces to Zachariah the birth of John the Baptist: "He (John) shall turn many of the children of Israel to the Lord their God, and *he shall go before him* in the spirit and power of Elijah, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children. . . ." He shall go before him . . . Before whom? The preceding words say expressly: "*before the Lord, their God.*" And if we could doubt that these words are a reproduction of those of Malachi, this doubt would fall away before the following words: "in the spirit and power of Elijah," which are literally taken from the following chapter of the same prophet (iv. 5, 6). No man in Israel, therefore, to whom the prophecies were familiar, could refuse to ascribe to the person of the Messiah a superhuman nature. There would be, consequently, even from the natural point of view, nothing surprising in the fact that Jesus, who proclaimed Himself the Messiah, should, at the same time, have affirmed His divine pre-existence.

A second instructive fact presents itself to us in the New Testament. The pre-existence of Christ is not only taught in the discourses of John; it is taught in the epistles of Paul. According to 1 Cor. viii. 6, as according to John's prologue, it is Christ who *created* all things. According to the same epistle, x. 4, the invisible rock which led Israel in the wilderness, and which delivered Israel, was Christ. According to Col. i. 15–17, He is "the first-born before the whole creation;" He is "before all things;" it is "by Him that all things are created, the heavenly and the earthly; all is by Him and for Him, all subsists in Him." And it is not only St. Paul who enunciates this idea. The epistle to the Hebrews which, by its desti-

nation even, testifies to the faith of the primitive Palestinian Church,[1] declares that it is Christ who made the world, whom the angels worship, who laid the foundations of the earth and the heavens, who is always the same, and is as much more exalted than Moses as the one who has built the house is greater than the house itself (i. 2, 6, 10, 12; iii. 3). More than this: the same idea is found again in the Apocalypse, that Judaizing book as it is claimed. Jesus is therein, as Jehovah Himself is in Isaiah, called *the first and the last;* that is to say, as the author himself explains it, the *beginning* and the *end* (ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος) of the whole creation;[2] all creatures fall down before the Lamb seated on the throne, as well as before the Father. It is not then either to any individual (whether the true, or the pseudo-John), or to any school (that of Ephesus), or to any semi-Gnostic party, or to any Church of Asia Minor, that the doctrine of the divinity and pre-existence of the Christ belongs; it is to the Church represented in all its parts by the authors and the readers of the writings which we have just quoted.[3] If it is so, this idea, so generally received, of the person of Christ must have rested upon positive testimonies which proceeded from the mouth of Jesus, such as those which we find in the fourth Gospel.

The first three Gospels themselves, far from contradicting this result, confirm it. We have already shown that these writings attribute to the person of Christ absolutely the same central position, as related to the human soul, which the Old Testament ascribes to God. For whom were absolute trust and love reserved by Moses and the prophets? Jesus claims them for Himself in the Synoptics, and this even in the name of our salvation. Would Jewish monotheism, which was so strict and so jealous of the rights of God, have permitted Jesus to take a position like this, if He had not had the distinct consciousness that in the background of His human existence there was a divine personality? He cannot, as a faithful Jew, wish to be for us that which in the Synoptics He asks to be, except so far as He is what He declares Himself to be in John.[4]

A large number of particular facts in the same writings add their force to this general conclusion. We have just seen how, in Luke, He who comes after the forerunner is called, in the preceding words, *the Lord their God.* In

[1] We cannot allow any critical probability to the opinion which seeks in Italy or in any other country than Palestine the persons to whom this epistle was addressed.

[2] i. 17; ii. 8; xxii. 13. Hilgenfeld claims that the Jesus of the Apocalypse is only the first created among the *angels* (iii. 14). But comp. xxii. 9, 16, which positively excludes this idea; xxii. 11 proves that ἀρχή, iii. 14, signifies not beginning, but origin, unless τέλος must signify that Jesus is the *end* of the existence of the universe, in the sense of de Hartmann!

[3] Here is what Weizsäcker himself says (p. 222): "At the time when the primitive apostolic tradition was still represented by a whole series of witnesses, the Apostle Paul taught respecting the person of Jesus a doctrine according to which He was the Son of God who had come from heaven to renew mankind, the one whom God made use of as His instrument in the creation of the world. And we do not find any trace of an opposition which this teaching had encountered in the primitive apostolic circles, and which gave it the character of a peculiar view."

[4] Schultz writes these words in his recent work on the divinity of Jesus Christ: "The sentiment of religious dependence is not admissible except before the *only* true God . . . We should not bow religiously except before that which is *really* divine." (*Die Lehre von der Gottheit Christi*, pp. 540, 541.)

Mark, the person of the Son is placed even above the most exalted creatures: "Of that day knoweth no one, not even the angels who are in heaven, nor even the Son [during the time of His humiliation], but the Father only" (xiii. 32). In Matthew, the Son is placed between the Father and the Holy Spirit, the breath of God: "Baptize all the nations in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit" (xxviii. 19). In the parable of the vine-dressers, Jesus Himself represents Himself, in contrast with the *servants* sent before Him, as the son and heir of the Master of the vineyard (Matt. xxi. 37, 38). It will be in vain to subject the question of Jesus (Matt. xxii. 45): "If David calls the Christ his Lord, how is he his son?" to all imaginable manipulations; the thought of Jesus will ever come forth simple and clear for him who does not try to find difficulties where there are none. If, on one side, the Christ is the son of David by His earthly origin, on the other side He is, nevertheless, his Lord, in virtue of His divine personality. This is what Micah had said already (v. 2). And how, if He did not have the consciousness of His divinity, could Jesus speak of *His* angels (Matt. xiii. 41), of *His* glory (xxv. 31), finally, of *His* name under the invocation of which believers are gathered together? The Old Testament did not authorize any creature thus to appropriate to himself the attributes of Jehovah. Now the notion of His pre-existence was for Jesus implicitly included in that of His divinity.

Undoubtedly, we do not find in the Synoptics any declaration as precise as those which we have just now quoted from the Johannean discourses. But do we not discover in the Gospel of Luke the immense quantity of materials which would be entirely wanting to us if we possessed only those of Matthew and Mark; for example, the three parables of grace (Luke xv.; the lost sheep, the lost drachma, the prodigal son); those of the unfaithful steward and of the wicked rich man (Luke xvi.); those of the unjust judge, and of the publican and the Pharisee (Luke xviii.); the story of Zacchæus; the incident of the converted thief, and so many other treasures which Luke has rescued from the oblivion where the other redactions of the tradition had left them, and which he alone has preserved to the Church? How, then, can we make of the omission of these few sayings in our first three Gospels an argument against their authenticity? If pictures so impressive, narratives so popular, as those which we have just recalled had not entered into the oral preaching of the Gospel, or into any of its written redactions, how much more easily could three or four expressions of a very elevated and profoundly mysterious character have been obliterated from the tradition, to reappear later as the reminiscences of a hearer who was particularly attentive to everything in the teaching of Jesus which concerned His person? The dogmatic interest which these declarations have for us did not exist to the same degree at that time; for the impression of the person of Jesus, contemplated daily in its living fullness, filled all hearts and supplied all special vacancies. Let us not forget, moreover, that of these three sayings one is found in the discourse which follows the multiplication of the loaves, a discourse which the Synoptics omit altogether; the second, in a discourse pronounced at Jerusalem, and which is

likewise omitted in them, together with the entire visit of which it forms a part; the third, in the sacerdotal prayer of which they have also given no report. As to John, according to his plan he must necessarily call them to mind, if he wished, as appears from xx. 30, 31, to give an account of the signs by which he had recognized in Jesus the Christ, *the Son of God*, and which might contribute to produce the same assurance of faith in his readers. These culminating points of the testimony of Jesus respecting His person could not be wanting in such a picture.

There remains the difference in *the eschatological ideas*. In the Synoptics, a visible return of the Lord, a final external judgment, a bodily resurrection of believers, a reign of glory; in John, no other return of Christ than His coming into the hearts in the form of the Holy Spirit; no other resurrection than that of the soul through regeneration; no other judgment than the separation which is effected between believers and unbelievers through the preaching of the Gospel; no other reign than the life of the believer in Christ and in God. "This entire Gospel is planned," says Hilgenfeld, "so as to present the historical coming of Christ as His only appearance on the earth."[1]—But is this exclusive spiritualism which is attributed to the fourth Gospel indeed a reality? John certainly emphasizes the return of Jesus in the spirit. But is this in order wholly to supersede and to deny His visible return? No, according to him, the first is the preparation for the second: "I will come again," here is the spiritual return. Then he adds: "And I will take you unto myself, that where I am (in my Father's house, where there are many mansions, and where Jesus Himself is now going), you may be also with me," xiv. 3; here is, in some sense, a consummation. "If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?" (xxi. 23.) And in the first epistle: "My little children, abide in Him, to the end that, when he shall appear, we may have boldness" (ii. 28). "We know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him" (iii. 3).—The spiritual judgment which John teaches is likewise, according to him, the preparation for the external judgment in which the economy of grace will end. "It is not I who will accuse you before the Father, it is Moses in whom you hope." "The hour is coming in which all who are in the tombs shall hear the voice of the Son of man, and shall come forth; those who have done good, to a resurrection of life; those who have done evil, to a resurrection of judgment" (v. 45 and 28, 29). Here, surely, an external judgment and a bodily resurrection are duly proclaimed. Scholten thinks, it is true, that these verses must be an interpolation. For what reason? They are not wanting in any manuscript, in any version. No; but the critic has decreed *a priori* what the fourth Gospel must be in order that it may be the antipode of the other three. And as these verses present an obstacle to this sovereign decision of *his* criticism, he takes his scissors and cuts them out. This is what at the present time is called *science*. Moreover, little is gained by these violent proceedings. Four times successively in chap. vi., indeed, Jesus returns to these troublesome

[1] *Einl.*, p. 728.

facts of the last day and the resurrection of the dead: "That I may not lose anything of what the Father hath given me, but that I may raise it up at the last day" (ver. 39); "that whosoever beholdeth the Son and believeth on Him may have eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day" (ver. 40); "no man can come unto me, except the Father draw him; and I will raise him up at the last day" (ver. 44); "he who eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood . . .; I will raise him up at the last day" (ver. 54). It will be confessed that considerable boldness is needed to maintain that a book, in which such a series of affirmations is found, does not teach either a last judgment or the resurrection of the body. But the critics count, and unfortunately with good reason, upon a public which does not examine critically.

The truth is that, in conformity with his custom, the author of the fourth Gospel speaks less of external results than of spiritual preparations, because the popular preaching, and as a consequence the Synoptics, did just the reverse. Without omitting the coming of the Holy Spirit and His action in the heart (Luke xxiv. 48, 49; Matt. xxviii. 19; Luke xii. 11, 12, etc.), the first Gospels had transmitted to the Church, in all its details, the teaching of Jesus respecting the destruction of Jerusalem and His visible return at the end of time (Matt. xxiv., Mark xiii., Luke xxi. and xvii.). John had nothing to add on these various points. As for ourselves, in reading the conclusions which the critics draw from his silence, we cannot conceal a feeling of astonishment; here are men who maintain that the great discourse of Jesus on the end of time, in the Synoptics, was never spoken by Him; that it is only a composition of some Jewish or Jewish-Christian author in the year 67 or 68; and the same men dare to allege the absence in John of this unauthentic discourse, as a reason *against* the trustworthiness of this Gospel! Should criticism become a matter of jugglery?

It is impossible, then, to detect an *essential* difference, that is to say, one bearing on the matter of the teaching, between the Synoptics and the fourth Gospel.

But what is to be thought of the entirely different *form* in which Jesus expresses Himself in the Johannean discourses and the Synoptic preachings? Here, brief moral maxims, strongly marked, popular, easy to be retained; there, discourses of a lofty and in a sense theological, import. Here, as Keim says, "the jewel of the parable;" there, not a single picture of this kind. In a word, there the simple and practical spirit; here a mystic, exalted, dreamy hue.

As to the *parable*, it is in fact wanting in John, at least in the form in which we find it in the first Gospels; but we must recall to mind the fact, that nothing was more adapted than this kind of discourse to form the substance of the popular evangelization in the earliest times of the Church. All that could be recalled of such teachings was, therefore, successively put in circulation in the tradition, and passed from thence into the first evangelical writings. What could have been the object of the author of the fourth Gospel in suppressing these teachings with which

he must have been acquainted, and which would have given credit to his book, on the supposition that his narrative was a fiction? But if he was simply recounting the history, what purpose would it serve to repeat that which every one could read in writings which were already within the reach of all? He could only have been led to take a different course if the parables had been a necessary land-mark in the history of the apostolic faith which he had it in mind to describe; but this was evidently not the case. Moreover, if we do not find in the fourth Gospel the parable in the form of a complete *story*, we do find it in a form closely allied to this, that of *allegory*.[1] Here is the analogue of what are called, in the Synoptics, the *parables* of the leaven or of the grain of mustard-seed; thus, the pictures of the Shepherd, the Door, and the Good Shepherd (chap. x.), or that of the woman who suddenly passes from the excess of grief to that of joy (xvi. 21), or again that of the vine and the branches (xv. 1 ff.). It is still the figurative and picturesque language of Him who, in the first Gospels, spoke to the people in these terms: "What went ye out into the wilderness to see? A reed shaken with the wind . . . . .? (Matt. xi. 7.) This question very nearly recalls the saying of Jesus in our Gospel (v. 35); "John was a lamp which shineth and burneth; and ye were willing to rejoice for a season in his light." Let the following similitudes, also, be compared: The Spirit is like the wind which blows where it wills, and the presence of which we know only because we hear the sound of it (iii. 8). The unbeliever is like the evil doer who seeks the night to accomplish his evil works (vv. 19, 20). Spiritual emancipation is the formula of manumission which the son of the house pronounces upon the slaves (viii. 36), etc. Each of these figures is a parable in the germ, which the author could have developed as such, if only he had wished to do so.

As to the elevated, *mystical* character of the discourses of Jesus, the language forms a contrast, it is true, with the simple, lively, piquant cast of the Synoptic discourses. But let us notice, first of all, that this contrast has been singularly exaggerated. Sabatier himself acknowledges this: "A comparison of these discourses with those of the Synoptics proves that, at the foundation, the difference between them is not so great as it appears to be at the first view." How can we fail to recognize the voice which strikes us so impressively in the Synoptics, in those brief and powerful words of the Johannean Christ, which seem to break forth from the depths of another world? "My Father worketh hitherto and I also work." "Destroy this temple, and I will raise it up in three days." "Apart from me ye can do nothing." "Except the grain be cast into the earth and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it beareth much fruit." "He who hath seen me, hath seen the Father." "The prince of this world cometh, but he hath nothing in me." There is a fact which is beyond dispute: we discover at least twenty-seven sayings of Jesus in John which are found in almost exactly

[1] It is remarkable that, in x. 6, John uses for characterizing this kind of comparisons the same word, παροιμία, which is so frequently employed in the Synoptics to designate the parables properly so-called.

the same form in the Synoptics (see the list in the note).[1] Very well! no one can maintain that these sayings in the least degree harmfully affect either the texture of John's text or that of the Synoptic text. This fact proves, indeed, that the difference which has been pointed out has been singularly exaggerated. If, in fact, sayings of such an original cast as those of Jesus can, simultaneously and without surprising us in the least degree, occupy a place in the two sorts of documents, this fact proves that these documents are fundamentally homogeneous.

Several expressions are especially alleged by the critics which belong to John's style and which are foreign to the Synoptics,—for example, the terms *light* and *darkness;* or expressions in use in the latter which are wanting in the former, like *the kingdom of heaven* (or *of God*), for which John substitutes the less Jewish and more mystical term *eternal life.* But the contrast of *light* and *darkness* is found, also, in the Synoptics, as witness

[1] John.	The Synoptics.
ii. 19: "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up."	Matt. xxvi. 61 (xxvii. 40): "This man said, I am able to destroy the temple of God, and to build it in three days" (Mark xiv. 58 and xv. 29).
iii. 18: "He that believeth on Him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already."	Mark xvi. 16: "He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be condemned."
iv. 44: "For Jesus Himself testified, that a prophet hath no honour in his own country."	Matt. xiii. 57: "Jesus said unto them, A prophet is not without honour, save in his own country, and in his own house" (Mark vi. 4 and Luke iv. 24).
v. 8: "Jesus saith unto him, Arise, take up thy bed and walk."	Matt. ix. 6: "Arise, take up thy bed, and go unto thine house" (Mark ii. 9; Luke v. 24).
vi. 20: "It is I; be not afraid."	Matt. xiv. 27: "It is I; be not afraid" (Mark vi. 50).
vi. 35: "He that cometh to me shall not hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst."	Matt. v. 6, Luke vi. 21: "Blessed are they that hunger and thirst: for they shall be filled."
vi. 37: "All that the Father giveth me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out."	Matt. xi. 28, 29: "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden . . . and ye shall find rest unto your souls."
vi. 46: "Not that any man hath seen the Father, save He which is from God, He hath seen the Father." Compare i. 18: "No man hath seen God at any time; the only-begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him."	Matt. xi. 27: "No man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him" (Luke x. 22).
xii. 8: "For the poor always ye have with you; but me ye have not always."	Matt. xxvi. 11: "For ye have the poor always with you; but me ye have not always" (Mark xiv. 7).
xii. 25: "He that loveth his life loseth it; and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal."	Matt. x. 39: "He that findeth his life shall lose it; and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it" (xvi. 25; Mark viii. 35; Luke ix. 24, xvii. 33).
xii. 27: "Now is my soul troubled; and what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour; but for this cause came I unto this hour."	Matt. xxvi. 38: "Then saith He unto them, My soul is exceeding sorrowful even unto death" (Mark xiv. 34 ff.).
xiii. 3: "Jesus knowing that the Father had given all things into His hands."	Matt. xi. 27: "All things have been delivered unto me of my Father."

Luke xi. 34–36 and Matthew vi. 22 and 23. Is it not already very common in the Old Testament? And as to the Johannean expression *eternal life*, it is employed in the Synoptics as the equivalent of the *kingdom of God*, absolutely as it is in John. We call to witness the examples quoted in the note, which have been very happily brought forward by Beyschlag.[1] John,

John.	The Synoptics.
xiii. 16: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, A servant is not greater than his lord; neither one that is sent greater than he that sent him."	Matt. x. 24: "A disciple is not above his master, nor a servant above his lord."
xiii. 20: "He that receiveth whomsoever I send, receiveth me; and he that receiveth me, receiveth Him that sent me."	Matt. x. 40: "He that receiveth you, receiveth me; and he that receiveth me, receiveth Him that sent me" (Luke x. 16).
xiii. 21: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me."	Matt. xxvi. 21: "Verily I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me" (Mark xiv. 18).
xiii. 38: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, The cock shall not crow, till thou hast denied me thrice."	Matt. xxvi. 34: "Verily I say unto thee, that this night, before the cock crow, thou shalt deny me thrice" (Mark xiv. 30; Luke xxii. 34).
xiv. 18: "I will not leave you desolate; I will come to you;" and 23: "We will make our abode with him."	Matt. xxviii. 20: "I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."
xiv. 28: "My Father is greater than I."	Mark xiii. 32: "That day knoweth no one, not even the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father."
xiv. 31: "Arise, let us go hence."	Matt. xxvi. 46: "Arise, let us be going."
xv. 20: "If they persecuted me, they will also persecute you."	Matt. x. 25: "If they have called the Master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his household."
xv. 21: "But all these things will they do unto you for my name's sake."	Matt. x. 22: "Ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake."
xvi. 32: "Behold, the hour cometh, yea, is come, that ye shall be scattered, every man to his own, and shall leave me alone."	Matt. xxvi. 31: "For it is written, I will smite the shepherd and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad."
xvii. 2: "As Thou gavest Him authority over all flesh."	Matt. xxviii. 18: "All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth."
xviii. 11: "Put up the sword into the sheath."	Matt. xxvi. 52: "Put up again thy sword into its place."
xviii. 20: "I ever taught in synagogues, and in the temple."	Matt. xxvi. 55: "I sat daily in the temple teaching."
xviii. 37: "Pilate therefore said unto Him: Art thou a king then? Jesus answered, Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end have I been born."	Matt. xxvii. 11: "And the governor asked him, saying, Art thou the king of the Jews? And Jesus said unto him, Thou sayest."
xx. 23: "Whose soever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven . . . ," etc.	Matt. xviii. 18 (xvi. 19): "What things soever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven . . . ," etc.

[1] The two verses placed in parallel lines are taken in each case from the same Gospel and from the same narrative:

Matt. xviii. 3: "Ye shall not enter *into the kingdom of heaven.*"	Matt. xviii. 8: "It is good for thee to enter *into life.*"
Matt. xix. 17: "If thou wouldest enter *into life.*"	Matt. xix. 23: "It is hard for a rich man to enter into *the kingdom of heaven.*"
Matt. xxv. 34: "Inherit *the kingdom prepared for you.*"	Matt. xxv. 46: "But the righteous into eternal life."
Mark ix. 45: "It is good for thee to enter *into life.*"	Mark ix. 47: "It is good for thee to enter *into the kingdom of God.*"

moreover, in the conversation with Nicodemus, twice uses (iii. 3, 5) the term *kingdom of God* (or *of heaven*, in the Sinaitic MS.).

What is there left, after all this, which suffices to establish, in respect to the form, an insoluble contrast between the words of Jesus in John and His language in the Synoptics? A certain difference remains; I do not deny this. It consists in that altogether peculiar tone of holy solemnity, and, if I may venture to speak thus, of heavenly suavity, which distinguishes not only our Gospel, but also the first Epistle of John, from all the other products of human thought, and which makes of these writings a literature by itself; with this difference, however, which has been already pointed out, that, while the course of thought is steady and of a strictly logical tenor in the Gospel, the subjects are treated in the epistles in a softer, more hesitating, and more diffuse way.—In order to explain the real contrast between the fourth Gospel and the preceding ones, we must first of all, as we have seen, take into account the influence exercised on the form of the discourses by the peculiar style of the translator, and by the work of condensation which was the condition of this reproduction. But, after this, there is still left a certain, in some sort, irreducible *remnant*, which demands a separate examination. It is said that *the unexplained remainders* in science are the cause of great discoveries. We are not ambitious of making a great discovery; but we would like, nevertheless, to succeed in giving, a little more clearly than has been given hitherto, an account of the difference with which we are concerned.

The question is whether this particular tone, which might be called the Johannean *timbre*, was foreign to Jesus, in such a degree that our evangelist was the real creator of it and, of his own impulse, attributed it to the Saviour; or whether it appertained to the language of Jesus Himself, at least in certain particular moments of His life. We have seen that the scenes related in our Gospel represent only a score of days, or even of moments, distributed over an activity of two years and a half. And it is consequently permitted us to ask whether these scenes, chosen evidently with a design, did not have an exceptional character which marked them out for the author's choice. He has made a selection among the facts, that is certain, and himself declares this (xx. 30, 31). Why might he not also have made one among the discourses? The selection in this case must have been with reference to the design of his work, which was to show that "Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God." If it is so, he was naturally obliged to choose, from among the numerous teachings of Jesus, the few words of an especially elevated character, which had, most of all, contributed to make him understand for himself the sublime richness of the being whom he had the happiness to see and to hear.

We have an expression which the author places in the mouth of Jesus, and according to which Jesus Himself distinguished between two sorts of discourses which were included in His teaching. He says to Nicodemus, iii. 12: "If I have told you *earthly things* (τὰ ἐπίγεια) and ye believe not, how shall ye believe when I tell you *heavenly things* (τὰ ἐπουράνια)?" In expressing Himself thus, Jesus recalled to Nicodemus the teachings which

He had given since His arrival in Jerusalem. What proved, indeed, that His hearers had not been laid hold of by them (*had not believed*), is the fact that Nicodemus himself was able to put forward, as the proof of the divine superiority of the Lord's teaching, only His miracles (ver. 2). What were those teachings of Jesus, in which He spoke of earthly things? His preachings in Galilee, such as we find them in the Synoptics, may give us an idea of them. It was the earth,—that is, human life, with all its different obligations and relations—considered from the heavenly point of view. It was, for example, that lofty morality which we find developed in the Sermon on the Mount: human life as related to God. But from this elementary moral teaching Jesus expressly distinguishes that which He calls the teaching of *heavenly things*. The object of the latter is no longer the earth estimated from the heavenly point of view; it is heaven itself with its infinite richness. This heaven—Jesus lived in it continually while acting upon the earth. He says this Himself in the following verse: "No man hath ascended to heaven but he who came down from heaven, the Son of man *who is in heaven*" (ver. 13). In the intimate and uninterrupted relation which He sustained to the Father, He had access here below to the divine thoughts, to the eternal purposes, to the plan of salvation, and He was able, in certain hours, to unfold to those who surrounded Him, friends or enemies, as He did in the progress of this nocturnal conversation with the pious councilor, the facts appertaining to this higher domain of the *heavenly things*. He would not have fully accomplished His mission, if He had absolutely concealed from the world what He was Himself for the heart of His Father, and what His Father was for Him. How could men have comprehended the infinite love of which they were the objects on heaven's part, if Jesus had not explained to them the infinite value of the gift which God made to them in His person. Does not love measure itself by the cost of the gift, by the greatness of the sacrifice? On the other hand, this revelation of the heavenly things could not be the *habitual* object of the Lord's teachings. Scarcely would one or two disciples have followed Him, if He had stayed upon these heavenly heights; the yet gross mass of the people who asked only for a Messiah after their own carnal heart—a king capable of every day giving them bread in the proper sense of the word (vi. 15, 34), would have remained strangers to His influence, and would soon have left Him alone with His two or three initiated ones.

It is undoubtedly for the same reason, that these teachings respecting the heavenly things remained, in general, outside of the limits of the first apostolical preaching and the oral telling of the Gospel story.

Nevertheless, even if this was the course of things, it is improbable that every trace of this mode of teaching, more lofty in matter and tone, would have completely disappeared from the Synoptic narrative. And, indeed, two of our evangelists—those who, along with John, have labored most to transmit to us the teachings of Jesus—Matthew and Luke, have preserved for us the account of a moment of extraordinary emotion in the Lord's life which presents us the example naturally looked for. It is

in Luke especially, that we must seek the faithful representation of it (chap. x.). Jesus has sent into the fields and villages of Galilee seventy of His disciples, weak spiritual children, to whom He has entrusted the task of making the population understand the importance of the work which is being accomplished at this time, and the nearness of the kingdom. They return to Him filled with joy, and inform Him of the complete success of their mission. At this moment, the evangelist tells us, "Jesus rejoiced in His spirit, and said: I thank thee, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes! Yea, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight. All things have been delivered unto me by my Father, and no one knoweth who the Son is but the Father, nor who the Father is but the Son, and he to whom the Son willeth to reveal him." In reading these words, we ask ourselves whether it is indeed from St. Luke or St. Matthew that we are reading, and not from St. John. What does this fact prove? That, according to the Synoptics themselves, in certain exceptional moments of elevation, the language of Jesus really assumed that sweet tone, that *mystic* tinge, as it has been called—is it not more correct to say, *heavenly?*—of which we find in them but one single example, and of which six or seven discourses in John bear, in greater or less degree, the impress. This passage of Luke and Matthew has been called an erratic block of Johannean rock strayed into the Synoptic ground. The figure is quite just; what does it prove? The smallest fragment of granite deposited on the calcareous slopes of Jura, is for the geologist the undeniable proof that somewhere in the lofty Alpine summits the entire rock is in its place. Otherwise this block would be a monstrosity for science. The same is true of this fragment of Johannean discourse in the Synoptic Gospels. It is fully sufficient to prove the existence, at certain moments, of this so-called Johannean language in the teaching of Jesus. The real difference between John and the Synoptics, on this most decisive point, amounts to this: while these last have handed down to us but a single example of this form of language, John has preserved for us several examples selected with a particular purpose.

As, on the one hand, it is certain from the very nature of things, that the peculiar style of the translator has colored that of the Preacher whose discourses he reproduces, on the other hand, the passage of the Synoptics, which we have just quoted, places beyond doubt the fact that the language of the Lord Himself had stamped its impression deeply on the soul of the evangelist, and exercised a decisive and permanent influence on his style. There was here, therefore, if I may venture to express myself thus, a reflex action, the secret of which, undoubtedly, no one will ever completely disclose.

Moreover, the discourses of Jesus in the fourth Gospel bear in themselves, for every one who has eyes to see them, the seal of their true origin, and, notwithstanding all the assertions of learned men, the Church will always know what it should think of them. An intimate, filial, unchanging communion with the God of heaven and earth, like that

which here reveals itself by the mouth of Jesus, must be lived in order to be thus expressed—what shall I say, in order to our having even a glimpse of it. The *inventor* of such discourses would be more than a genius of the first rank; he would need to be himself a Son of God, a Jesus equal to the true one. Criticism gains only one more embarrassment by such a supposition.

C. *The Johannean notion of the Person of Jesus.*

Is it possible for us to go back even to the single source from which flow forth, like two diverging streams, the two forms of Jesus' teaching which we have just established. First of all, let us set aside the opinion, at present somewhat widespread, which holds that a dualism can be discerned even in the teaching of our Gospel. Two scholars, Baur and Reuss, have claimed that the author of this work did not hold a real incarnation of the Logos; that, according to him, the divine being continued in Jesus in the possession and exercise of His heavenly attributes, in such a way that His humanity was only a passing and superficial covering, which did not modify, in any respect, the state which He had possessed before coming to the earth. Starting from this point of view, Reuss finds in our Gospel a series of contradictions between certain words of Jesus, which he believes to be authentic, and that conception which is exhibited in the amplifications due to the pen of the evangelist. While in the former, Jesus distinctly affirms His inferiority to the Father, the author of our Gospel, filled with his own notion of the Logos, presents Him as equal with God. It is difficult to conceive a more complete travesty of the Johannean narrative. We have already shown that no Gospel sets forth with more pronounced features than this one the real humanity of Jesus, body, soul and spirit. The body is *exhausted* (iv. 6); the soul is overwhelmed in *trouble* (xii. 27); the spirit itself is *agitated* (xiii. 21) and *groans* (xi. 33). What place remains in such a being for the presence of an *impassible* Logos? More than this: according to the prologue, which is certainly the work of the evangelist, the Logos Himself, in His state of divine pre-existence, tends *towards God* as to His centre (i. 1); He dwells in God, as a first-born Son *in the bosom* of His Father (i. 18). Where in this representation is the place for a being *equal* with God? No; the subordination of the Son to the Father is affirmed by the evangelist as distinctly as it could have been by Jesus when speaking of Himself; and as for His real humanity, it is emphasized by this same evangelist more strongly than by any one of the Synoptics.

There is, then, no trace of a twofold contradictory theology in our Gospel.[1] This supposition is already, in its very nature, in the highest degree improbable. It implies a fact which it is very difficult to admit. This fact is, that so profound a thinker as the one who composed this work, the most powerful mind of his epoch, could, without being in the least degree

[1] As Beyschlag now claims; comp. also the thesis of Jean Réville, *La doctrine du Logos*, 1881.

aware of it, simultaneously teach two opposite conceptions respecting the subject which occupied the first place in his thoughts and in his heart.

The idea which the evangelist formed of the person of Christ, and which is in perfect accord with even the smallest historical or didactic details of the entire narrative, is clearly formulated by the author in the prologue: "The Word was made flesh,"—which evidently signifies that the being whom he calls the Word *divested* Himself of His divine state and of all the attributes which constituted it, in order to exchange it for a completely human state, with all the characteristics of weakness, ignorance, sensibility to pleasure and pain, which constitute our peculiar mode of life here below.[1] This mode of conceiving of the person of Christ during His sojourn on the earth is not peculiar to John; it is also that of Paul, who tells us in Philippians: "He who was in the form of God . . . emptied himself, taking upon him the form of a servant, and being made in the likeness of men" (ii. 6, 7); and also in Second Corinthians: "Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, who, though he was rich, for your sakes became poor, that ye, through his poverty, might become rich" (2 Cor. viii. 9). The same teaching is found in the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse, though it would require too much space to show this here.[2] Here is the key to all the Christological ideas of the New Testament. It is, in particular, the explanation of that double form of teaching which we find in the mouth of Christ, in John and in the Synoptics.

Up to His baptism, Jesus had lived in a filial communion with God; that saying of the child of twelve years is the proof of this: "Must I not be in that which belongs to my Father?" (Luke ii. 49.) But He had not as yet the distinct consciousness of His eternal, essential relation to the Father; His communion with Him was of a moral nature; it sprang from His pure conscience and His ardent love for Him. In this state, He must, indeed, have had a presentiment that He was the physician of sinful humanity, as the Messiah. But an immediate divine testimony was necessary, in order that He should be able to undertake the redemptive work. This testimony was given to Him at His baptism; at that moment the heavens were opened to Him; the heavenly things, which He was to reveal to others, were unveiled to Him. At the same time the mystery of His own person became clear to Him; He heard the voice of the Father which said to Him: "Thou art my beloved Son." From that day He knew Himself perfectly; and knowing Himself *as* the only-begotten *Son*, the object of all the Father's love, He knew also how greatly the Father loved the world to which He was giving Him: He knew fully, as man, the Father himself, *the Father* in all the riches of the meaning of this word. Thus it was that, from this day onward, He carried heaven in His heart, while living on the earth. He had, then, if we may so speak,

[1] The same expression is used (ii. 9), to express the change of the water into wine: one same substance, but clothed with different attributes.

[2] Comp. Heb. i. 3; ii. 17, 18; v. 6–8; Apoc. i. 1, 18; iii. 12, 21; v. 5.

two sources of information: one, the experience of the *earthly things* which He had learned to know during the thirty years of life which He had just passed here on earth as a mere man; the other, the permanent intuition of the *heavenly things* which had just unveiled themselves to Him at the hour of the baptism. How can we be surprised, therefore, that Jesus spoke alternately of the one and the other, according to the wants of His hearers, finding in the first the common ground which was needed by Him to excite their interest and gain their attention, deriving from the second the matter of the new revelation, by means of which He was to transform the world? On the one side, there were the moral obligations of man, his relations to things here below, treated from a divine point of view, as we see particularly in the Synoptics; on the other, the higher mystery of the relation of love between the Father and the Son, and of the love of both towards a world sunk in sin and death, a world to which the Father gives the Son and the Son gives Himself.

It seems to me that, by placing ourselves at this point of view, we may see springing up, as if by a sort of moral necessity, the two modes of teaching which fill science, but not the Church, with astonishment. Do we not know young persons or mature men who, after having led a perfectly moral life, see all at once opening before them, through the mysterious act of the new birth, the sanctuary of communion with Christ, the life of adoption, the inward enjoyment of the fatherly love of God? Their language assumes then, at certain moments, a new character which astonishes those who hear them speak thus, and ask themselves whether it is, indeed, the same man. There is in their tone something elevated, something sweet, which was previously strange to them. The words are, as it were, words coming from a higher region. We are tempted to cry out with the poet:

> Ah! qui n'oublierait tout à cette voix céleste!
> Ta parole est un chant . . .

but without adding, with him,

> où rien d'humain ne reste.[1]

For this divine language is, nevertheless, the most human language which can be spoken. Then, when this moment of exaltation has passed, and the ordinary life resumes its own course, the ordinary language returns with it, although ever grave, ever holy, ever dominated by the immediate relation with God which henceforth forms the background of the entire life. Such experiences are not rare; they serve to explain the mystery of the twofold teaching and the twofold language of the Word made flesh, from the moment when He had been revealed to Himself by the testimony of the Father.[2]

[1] Ah, who would not all forget in that celestial voice.
Thy speech is a song . . . . where nothing of man remains.

[2] Regarded from this point of view, the fact of the incarnation, while still presenting to human reason profound mysteries, does not seem to us to contain unsolvable contradictions.

But, even if we cannot reach in thought the sublime point where, in the person of Christ, the two converging lines of the humanity which rises to the highest point, and the divinity which humbles itself most profoundly, meet together, do we not know that, in mathematics, no one refuses to acknowledge the reality of the point where the two lines called asymptotes meet when infinitely produced, and that the operations are carried on with reference to this point as with reference to a positive quantity? Weiss rightly says:[1] "It is necessary, indeed, to consider that the appearance of Jesus in itself, as the realization of a divinely human life, was much too rich, too great, too manifold, not to be presented in a different way according to the varied individualities which received its rays, and according to the more or less ideal points of view at which these rays were reflected; while, however, this difference could not be prejudicial to the unity of the fundamental impression, and of the essential character in which this personality made itself known."

Criticism has often compared the difference with which we are concerned to that which is presented by the two representations of the person of Socrates, traced by Plato and Xenophon. At the outset, the historians of philosophy turned to the side of Xenophon, thinking that they could recognize the true historical type in the simple, practical, varied, popular Socrates of the *Memorabilia*. At that time, the Socrates of Plato was regarded as only a mouth-piece chosen by that author in order to set forth his own theory of ideas. Xenophon was the historian, Plato the philosopher. But criticism has changed its mind; Schleiermacher, above all, has taught us that, if the teaching of Socrates had not contained speculative elements, such as Plato attributes to him, and elements as to which the other writer is completely silent, no account could be given either of the relation which so closely united the school of Plato to the person of Socrates, or of the extraordinary attractive power which the latter exercised over the most eminent and most speculative minds of his time, or of the profound revolution effected by him in the progress of Greek thought.[2] With Xenophon alone, there remains a vacancy—a vacancy which we cannot fill except with the aid of Plato. This fact arises, on the one hand, from the special aim of Xenophon's book, which was to make a moral defense of his master; on the other, from the circumstance that Xenophon, a practical man, lacked the philosophical capacity which was necessary for the apprehension of the higher elements of the Socratic teaching. Zeller also acknowledges that Xenophon did not comprehend the scientific value of Socrates; "that Socrates cannot have been that exclusive and unscientific moralist for which he was so long taken," while the starting-point for criticism was made from the work of Xenophon only. "There is," he says, "in the exposition of each of the two writers, a *surplus* (Ueberschuss) which can without difficulty be introduced into the common portrait." No doubt, Plato has put into the mouth of Socrates his

[1] Introduction to his Commentary on the Gospel of John, p. 33.

[2] Scholars like Brandis and Ritter hold this opinion.

own theory of ideas. But it was only the development of the teaching of Socrates himself; and it must be admitted that where he puts Socrates on the stage as an historical personage (in the *Apology* and the *Symposium*, for example), he does not take this course.[1]

This parallel presents, *mutatis mutandis*, several remarkable correspondences in detail. But it offers, above all, this fundamental analogy that, in the case of Socrates as in that of Jesus, we find ourselves in the presence of two portraits of an historical personage, the perfect synthesis of which it is impossible to make. Now, if philosophy is still seeking after the fusion of the two portraits of the wisest of the Greeks, are we to be surprised that theology has not yet succeeded in effecting that of the two pictures of Christ. Is the richness of the former, a man whose influence on the moral history of his people was so serious, but so transient, to be compared to the richness of Him whose appearance has renewed and is constantly renewing the world? And if there was in the former that which furnishes matter for two portraits, both of them true and yet not reducible to a single one, why should we be surprised to see the same phenomenon reappearing with regard to Him who could have exclaimed in Greece: "A greater than Socrates is here," as He did exclaim in Judea: "A greater than Solomon is here."

"No one knoweth *the Son* but *the Father*," says Jesus in the Synoptics. The point of convergence of the two representations—the Johannean and the Synoptic, is accordingly the consciousness which the Son had of Himself. We shall, undoubtedly, not be successful in reconstructing it perfectly here on earth.

We behold *one* sun in the arch of heaven; and yet what a difference between its burning reflection on the slopes of the Alpine glaciers and its calm and majestic image in the waves of the ocean! The source of light is one, but the two mirrors are different.

We conclude:

1. The primal idea of the Johannean work did not by any means necessarily impair its historical character.

2. The truthfulness of the narrative appears manifestly from the comparison of the story with that of the Synoptics, to which it is invariably superior in the cases where they differ.

3. The truthfulness of the account of the discourses, which is supported by such strong positive reasons, does not in fact encounter any insurmountable difficulty.

The fourth Gospel is, therefore, a truly historical work.

§ 2. THE RELATION OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL TO THE RELIGION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Modern criticism believes itself able to prove a tendency in the fourth Gospel decidedly hostile to Judaism. Baur thinks that the author of this book desired to introduce anti-Jewish Gnosticism into the Church; that he

[1] *Philos. der Griechen*, IIter Th., 3d ed., pp. 85 ff.; 151, 155.

was a Docetist and dualist, professing the non-reality of the body of Jesus and the eternal contrast between darkness and light. Without going as far as this, Reuss says, 'that he speaks of the Jews as of a class of foreigners, with whom he had no connection;" that "all that preceded Jesus belongs, according to him, to a past without any value, and can only serve to lead men astray and cause them to miss the gate of salvation" (x. 8).[1] Renan also attributes to the evangelist a "lively antipathy" to Judaism. Hilgenfeld, finally, is the one who has gone, and still goes, the farthest in the affirmation of this thesis. He originally ascribed our Gospel to some Gnostic writer of the second century; he has since softened this assertion; he thinks that the author, while belonging to the Church, "nevertheless goes a considerable distance along with Gnosticism." According to the fourth evangelist, "Judaism belonged, as much as paganism, to the darkness which preceded the Gospel;" the religion of the Old Testament possessed "only an imperfect and dim prefiguration of Christianity." The knowledge of the true God was wanting to it as much as to Samaritan paganism.[2]

What is alleged in justification of such judgments? In the first place, some particular *terms*, familiar to the evangelist, such as this: *the Jews*, an expression which he employs in a sense always hostile to that people; or that other expression: *your law*, a term in which a feeling of disdain for the Mosaic institution and the Old Testament betrays itself. But the unfavorable sense attached in our Gospel to the name, *the Jews*, to designate the enemies of the light, proceeds not from a subjective feeling of the evangelist, but from the fact itself—that is to say, from the position taken towards Jesus from the beginning (John ii.) by the mass of the nation and by their rulers. The author uses this term also, when there is occasion for it (which is rare), in an entirely neutral sense, as in ii. 6 ("the purification of the Jews") and xix. 40 ("the custom of the Jews to embalm bodies"); or even in a favorable sense, as in the passages iv. 22 ("salvation is from the Jews") and xi. 45 ("many of the Jews who came to Mary believed on him"). We may also cite here the use of the name *Israelite*, applied as a title of honor to Nathanael (i. 48). In the Apocalypse, which is affirmed to be an absolutely Judaizing work, the Jews who obstinately resist the Gospel are designated in a much more severe way: "Those who say they are Jews and who are not, but are *the synagogue of Satan*" (ii. 9; comp. iii. 9).[3] The great crisis which had cast Israel out of the kingdom of God, and which had made it henceforth a body foreign and even hostile to the Church, had begun already during the ministry of Jesus. This is what the author sets forth by this term: *the Jews*, which is contrasted in his narrative with the term: *the disciples*. In making Jesus say *your law*, the evangelist cannot have had the intention of disparaging the Mosaic institution, any

[1] *Théol. joh.*, pp. 82 and 19.

[2] *Das Evangelium und die Briefe Johannis*, 1849; comp. with his more recent article in the *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* 1865, and *Einleitung*, pp. 722 ff.

[3] Ewald (*Comment. in Apoc. Joh.* ad. h. l.): "John, in a piquant way, calls the Jews an assembly, not of God, but of Satan, as Jesus Himself does (John viii. 37–44)."

more than in making Jesus say: "Abraham *your father*" (viii. 56), he dreamed of depreciating that patriarch. He exalts him, on the contrary, in that very verse, by setting forth the joyous sympathy which he experiences in a higher state of existence for Himself and His work: "Abraham rejoiced in expectation of seeing my day, and he saw it and was glad." In the same way, x. 34, after having used the expression: *your law*, He immediately adds, in connection with the passage of the O. T. which he has just quoted, these words: "And since the Scripture cannot be broken," making *the law* thus a divine and infallible revelation. Elsewhere He declares that "it is the Scriptures which testify of him" (v. 39); that the sin of the hearers consists in "not having the word of God abiding in them" (ver. 38), and even that the real cause of their unbelief towards Him is nothing else than their unbelief with respect to the *writings* of Moses (vv. 46, 47). The evangelist who makes Jesus speak thus evidently does not seek to disparage the law; the contradiction would be too flagrant. Jesus, therefore, in using the expression *your law*, means: "that law which you *yourselves* recognize as the sovereign authority," or: "that law which you invoke against me, and in the name of which you seek to condemn me." It must be remarked that He could not say "*our law*," because His personal relation to that institution was too widely different from that of the ordinary Jews to be included under the same pronoun; just as He could not say, when speaking of God: "*our* Father," but only "*my* Father," and "*your* Father" (xx. 17).

It has been remarked that Jesus never speaks in this Gospel of *the law* as the principle on which the life of the new community is to rest. This is true; but this is because He supposes the law to have become the *internal* principle of the life of believers through the fact of their communion with Him.

Critics also allege the freedom with which Jesus, in His cures, was ready to violate the *Jewish Sabbath*. Hilgenfeld even discovers the intention of abolishing that institution in the words of v. 17: "My Father worketh hitherto, and I also work." As to the Sabbath cures, they are found in the Synoptics as well as in John; and there, as here, it is these acts which begin to excite the deadly hatred of the Jews against Him (Luke vi. 11). But we formally deny the position that by these healings Jesus really violated the terms of the Mosaic command. He transgressed nothing else than that *hedge* of arbitrary statutes by which the Pharisees had thought fit to surround the fourth commandment. Jesus remained, from the beginning to the end, in our Gospel as in the others, *the minister of the circumcision* (Rom. xv. 8),—that is to say, the scrupulous observer of the law. As to the words of v. 17, they are by no means contrary to the idea of the Sabbath rest; they only mean: "As the Father labors in the work of the salvation of humanity—and this work evidently suffers no interruption at any moment whatsoever, still less on the Sabbath day than on any other—the Son cannot fold His arms and leave the Father to labor alone." This declaration does not contradict the Sabbatic rest when properly understood.

Hilgenfeld alleges also the two following passages: iv. 21, and viii. 44.

In the first, Jesus says to the Samaritan woman: "The hour cometh when ye shall no longer worship the Father either in this mountain or at Jerusalem," which proves, according to him, that Jesus wished to set Himself in opposition to the Jews no less than to the Samaritans, and that consequently, when he says in the following verse: "Ye worship that which ye know not," this judgment applies to the former as well as to the latter. The Jewish religion would therefore be, according to these words of Jesus, as erroneous as all the rest.—But there is enough in the following words: "because salvation comes from the Jews," to refute this explanation; for, instead of *because*, the author would have been obliged in that case to have said *although*: "*Although* the Jews are as ignorant as you and all the others, it has pleased God to make salvation come forth from the midst of them." The *because* (ὅτι) has no meaning unless Jesus in the preceding words had accorded to the Jews a knowledge of God superior to that of the Samaritans. This fact proves that the words: "*We worship* that which we know" apply not only to Him, Jesus, personally, but to Him conjointly with all *Israel*.[1] The true meaning of the words of ver. 21 is explained by ver. 23 (which resumes ver. 21): "Your worship, as for you Samaritans, will not be confined to this mountain Gerizim, nor will it, any more, be transported and localized anew at Jerusalem." Indeed, this second alternative must have appeared to the woman the only one possible, when once the first was set aside.

In the passage viii. 44, Jesus says to the Jews, according to the ordinary construction: "You are *of a father, the devil*." Hilgenfeld translates, as is no doubt grammatically possible: "You are *of the father of the devil*." This father of the devil is, according to him, the God of the Jews, the Creator of the material world, who in some of the Gnostic systems (Ophites, Valentinians) was actually presented as the father of the demon. This is not all; Jesus says at the end of the same verse: "When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own, because he is a liar, *and his father*," which is ordinarily understood in this sense: because he is a liar and the father of the liar (or of the lie). But Hilgenfeld explains: because he (the devil) is a liar, *as also, his father* (is a liar). And he finds here a second time the father of the devil, who is called "a liar as well as his son," because, throughout the entire Old Testament, the God of the Jews made Himself pass for the supreme God, while He was only an inferior divinity.—The author of this explanation is astonished that it could have been regarded as monstrous, and claims "that no one has yet advanced the first reasonable word against it." He must, nevertheless, acknowledge the following facts: 1. The father of the devil is a personage totally foreign to the Biblical sphere, and the author of our Gospel would have greatly compromised the success of his fraud by introducing him on the stage. 2. The notion of two opposite and personal Gods, of whom the second is another being than the devil, is so opposed to the Israelitish and

[1] It was only through placing Himself in opposition to a foreign people (the Samaritans), that He could say *we* in speaking of Himself and the other Jews, as He does here.

Christian monotheism professed by the author (v. 44), that it is impossible to admit such a teaching here. 3. What Jesus, according to the entire context, wishes to prove to the Jews, is that they are the *children* of the devil, but not his *brothers*, as would follow from Hilgenfeld's translation: "You are born of the father of the devil." In this whole passage the matter in hand is that of contrasting filiation with filiation, father with father. "Ye do that which ye have seen with your father," Jesus said, ver. 38. The Jews replied to Him: "We have only one father, God" (ver. 41). And Jesus' answer is the echo of theirs: "Ye are born of a father, [who is] the devil." The first epistle offers a decisive parallel (iii. 10). "In this the *children of God* are manifest, and the *children of the devil*." 4. Finally, let us remark, that if the first words of the verse are applied to the *father of the devil*, it is necessary to apply to this same personage the whole series of the following propositions, even inclusive of the last. These words: "because he is a liar as well as his father," would signify, then (according to the explanation of Hilgenfeld): the father of the devil is a liar and his father none the less so. After having seen the father of the devil make his appearance, we should find ourselves here in the presence of his grandfather! All this phantasmagoria vanishes away before a single comma introduced between the two genitives πατρός (of a father) and τοῦ διαβόλου (of the devil), which makes the second substantive appositional with the former, and not its complement. The necessity of this explanation from the grammatical standpoint appears from the opposition to ver. 41: "We have one father [who is] God," and religiously from ii. 16, where the temple of the God of the Jews, in Jerusalem (which, according to Hilgenfeld, ought to be the house of the devil's father), is called by Jesus "the house of my Father." It is certainly, therefore, according to our Gospel, the *only true God* (xvii. 3) who is worshiped at Jerusalem.

Hilgenfeld and Reuss rest also upon the words of x. 8: "All those who came before me are thieves and robbers;" they think that Jesus meant to characterize by these two terms all the eminent men of the Old Covenant. Who then? The patriarchs and Moses, the psalmists and the prophets? And that in a book in which the author makes Jesus say, that to believe Moses is implicitly to believe in Him (v. 46, 47); in which He Himself declares that Isaiah beheld in a vision the glory of the Logos before His incarnation, and foretold the unbelief of the people towards the Messiah (xii. 38, 41); in which the words of a psalmist are quoted as the word of God which cannot be broken (x. 34, 35); in which Abraham is represented as rejoicing exceedingly at the sight of the coming of the Christ (viii. 56)! No; the quoted expression applies simply to the actual rulers of the nation, who already for a considerable period were in possession of power at the time when Jesus was accomplishing His work in Israel. This is clearly indicated by the present: εἰσί, *are*, and not, *were*, as the word has sometimes been rather thoughtlessly translated. "Those who came before me *are* thieves and robbers."

Reuss maintains that, in general, no expression in this work connects the Church in a more special way with Judaism: and Hilgenfeld affirms

that this work "breaks every bond between Christianity and its Jewish roots." And yet the second of these scholars cannot help acknowledging what the first tries in vain to deny: that in the declaration of i. 11: "He came to his own, and his own received him not," the author really speaks of *the Jews*, considering them, he himself adds—"as the people of God or of the Logos."[1] No doubt, he endeavors afterwards to escape from the consequences of this conclusive fact, but by means of subterfuges which do not deserve even to be mentioned. Moreover, let the following facts be weighed: The temple of Jerusalem is "*the house of the Father*" of Jesus Christ (ii. 16); salvation comes from *the Jews* (iv. 22); the sheep whom Jesus gathers from the theocracy constitute the nucleus of the true Messianic flock (x. 16); the Paschal lamb slain at Jerusalem prefigures the sacrifice of the Messiah, even in the minute detail that the bones of both are to be preserved unbroken (xix. 36); the most striking testimony of the Father on behalf of Jesus is that which is given to Him by the Scriptures of the Old Covenant (v. 39). Finally, the author himself declares that he wrote his book to prove that Jesus is not only the *Son of God*, as he is so often made to say, but, first of all, *the Christ*, the Messiah promised to the Jews (xx. 30, 31).[2] The *Messianic* character of Jesus is expressly pointed out before His *divine* character. From end to end, our Gospel makes the appearance and work of Jesus the final evolution, the crowning of the Old Covenant.

As to all the passages which Hilgenfeld alleges with the design of proving that Jesus denies to Judaism all true knowledge of God (vii. 28; viii. 19; xv. 21; xvi. 25, etc.), they do not prove anything whatever; it is not to the Jewish religion as such, it is to the carnal and proud Jews who surround Him, that this often repeated reproach is addressed, that they did not know God, the God who nevertheless had revealed Himself to them. The prophets had all spoken in the same way, and had distinguished from the mass of the people (*this people*, Is. vi. 10) the elect, "the holy remnant" (vi. 13). They surely were not, for this reason, *anti-Jewish*.

The charge of *dualism*, directed against our Gospel by Hilgenfeld particularly, falls before this simple remark of Hase:[3] "A *moral* relation is thereby falsely translated into a *metaphysical* relation." Is it necessary to find a dualistic notion in that saying of Jesus: "To *you* it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom; but to *them* it is not given" (Matt. xiii. 11)? or, in that other, ver. 38: "The good seed are the children of the kingdom; the tares are the children of the evil one?" or, again, in the contrast which St. Paul makes, 1 Cor. ii. 14, 15, between the *psychical* man who cannot understand spiritual things, and the *pneumatic* man who judges all things? Who ever dreamed, because of such words, of imputing to Jesus and to Paul the idea of two human *races*, one proceeding from God, the other from the devil. The Scriptures teach throughout that a holy power and

[1] *Einlettung*, p. 723.

[2] It is curious to observe how, in the citation of this passage, our critics are sometimes guilty of an inconsiderate inaccuracy in striking out this term, *the Christ*; comp. Sabatier, *Encyclop.*, p. 184. There are other examples of this.

[3] *Geschichte Jesu*, p. 44.

an evil power act simultaneously on the heart of man, and that he can freely surrender himself to the one or the other. The more emphatic the choice is in the one direction or the other, the more is the man given up to the moral current which bears him away, and thus it may happen that on the path of evil a man becomes incapable of discerning and feeling any longer the attraction of what is good. Here is the *incapacity* which Jesus so often charges upon the Jews; it is their own act; otherwise, why reproach them with it, and to what purpose call them again to repentance and to a renewal by faith? This hardness is only relative, because it is voluntary; Jesus declares this most expressly in that so profound explanation of Jewish unbelief (v. 44): "How can ye believe, ye who receive your glory one from another, and seek not the glory which comes from God only?" If, then, they *cannot* believe, it is because they *will not*, because they have made themselves the slaves of a good which is opposite to the benefits which faith procures,—*of human glory*. This dualism is moral, the effect of the will, not metaphysical or of nature. By teaching otherwise, the author would contradict himself; for has he not said in the prologue that "all things were made by the Logos, and that nothing, not even a single thing, came into being without Him?" Undoubtedly, Hilgenfeld claims that the existence of the darkness, i. 5, not having been explained as caused by anything, implies the eternity of the evil principle; but following upon that which precedes (the creation, the primitive state), it is altogether natural to find here the appearance of evil in humanity—the fall, as it is related after the creation in the story of Genesis, which the author follows, as it were, step by step.

Baur found in our Gospel the spirit of Gnostic *Docetism*, which would be, no less than dualism, in contradiction to the spirit of the Old Testament. But every one seems, at the present day, to have abandoned this opinion, and we believe that we can remit to exegesis the charge of proving the emptiness of it.[1] In order to maintain it, we must torture the meaning of that expression in which the whole work is summed up: "The Word *was made* flesh," and must reduce the force of it to this idea: The Word was *clothed* with a *bodily appearance*. The fourth Gospel throughout repels this mode of explaining the incarnation, which is also, up to a certain point, that which Reuss attributes to it. A being who is fatigued, who is thirsty, whose soul is troubled at the approach of suffering, and who must be preserved by extraordinary circumstances from the breaking of his bones; a being who rises from the dead, and who says: "Touch me not," or, again: "Reach hither thy finger," has certainly a real and material body, or the author does not know what he is saying.

Hilgenfeld discovers, finally, in the opposition of our Gospel to *Chiliasm* a proof of its anti-Judaic spirit. "The entire Gospel," says this writer, "is planned in such a way as to present the historical coming of Christ as His only appearance on the earth." But, first, it is false to regard Chiliasm, the expectation of a final reign of Christ over mankind, as the mark of a

[1] See on the passages vii. 10 and viii. 59.

Judaistic tendency. Hase rightly says: "This was the belief of nearly the whole Church in the second century, and even till far on in the third." But further, as the same author adds, "our Gospel, while turning the attention away from everything which delights the senses, does not contradict that hope." We have seen this, indeed; with many repetitions, mention is made of a glorious resurrection *of the body* which is promised to believers, and of a *last day*. But here, as in all things, John makes it his study to set forth the spiritual preparation on which the Synoptics had not dwelt, rather than the outward results described by the latter in so lively and striking a way.

We have, in this chapter, developed only the points which are related to the characteristics of our Gospel, without touching upon that which comes into the question of its origin,—of its composition by this author or by that. It is in studying this last subject that we shall seek for the origin of the notion and the term *Logos*. What concerned us at this point was to thoroughly establish the relation of our Gospel to the Old Covenant. This relation is a double one, as we have proved: on the one side, the Johannean Gospel fully recognizes the divinity of the Old Testament, law and prophets; on the other, it sees in the work and teaching of Christ a decided superiority to the old revelations. The God of Israel is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, but the patriarchal and prophetic revelations only made Him known imperfectly. It is the only-begotten Son, reposing in His bosom, who has come to reveal Him to us. "The law was given by Moses;" it prepared its faithful subjects to receive Jesus Christ; but it is only in Him that there is accorded to the believer a divine "fullness of grace and truth" (i. 16–18). The Word had in Israel His *home*, long since prepared on the earth; but the new birth through which a man obtains the life of God is impossible except through faith in the Word who has come in the flesh (i. 12, 13).

The evangelist began by recognizing in Jesus the promised Christ; thence he rose to the knowledge of the Son of God (i. 41; vi. 69; xvi. 28, 29). The expression in xx. 31, sums up this development.

§ 3. THE STYLE OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

It remains for us to study our Gospel from a literary point of view. Tholuck, in the introduction to his brief commentary, has well set forth the unique character of the evangelist's language. There is nothing analogous to it in all literature, sacred or profane; childlike simplicity and transparent depth, holy melancholy and vivacity no less holy; above all, the sweetness of a pure and gentle love. "Such a style could only emanate," says Hase, "from a life which rests in God and in which all opposition between the present and the future, between the divine and human, has wholly come to an end.

Let us try to state precisely the peculiarities of this style.[1]

[1] It is impossible to treat this subject with more acuteness and delicacy than Luthardt does in the Introduction to his Commentary, 2d ed., 1875, Vol. I., pp. 14–62.

1. The vocabulary, upon the whole, is *poor*. It is, in general, the same expressions which reappear from one end to the other: *light* (φῶς) twenty-three times; *glory, to be glorified* (δόξα, δοξάζεσθαι) forty-two times; *life, to live* (ζωή, ζῆν) fifty-two times; *to testify, testimony* (μαρτυρεῖν, μαρτυρία) forty-seven times; *to know* (γινώσκειν) fifty-five times; *world* (κόσμος) seventy-eight times; *to believe* (πιστεύειν) ninety-eight times; *work* (ἔργον) twenty-three times; *name* (ὄνομα) and *truth* (ἀλήθεια) each twenty-five times; *sign* (σημεῖον) seventeen times. Not only does the author not hesitate to repeat these words in his work, but he does this, and with reiteration, in sentences which are very closely allied to one another. At the first glance, this gives to his style a monotonous character; but only at the first glance. These expressions soon compensate the reader for their small number by their intrinsic richness. They are not at all, as one thinks at the first sight, purely abstract notions, but powerful spiritual realities, which can be contemplated under a multitude of aspects. If the author possesses in his vocabulary only a small number of terms, these words may be compared to pieces of gold with which great lords make payments. This feature is in harmony with the oriental mind, which loves to plunge into the infinite. The Old Testament already is familiar with these so rich expressions and their deep meaning: *light, darkness, truth, falsehood, glory, name, life, death.*

2. Certain favorite forms, which, without precisely offending against the laws of the Greek language, are nevertheless foreign to that language, betray a *Hebraistic* mode of thinking. Thus, to designate the most intimate spiritual union, the use of the term *to know;* to indicate moral dependence with respect to another being, the terms *to be in* (εἶναι ἐν), *to dwell in* (μένειν ἐν); to characterize the relation between a spiritual principle and the person in whom it is incarnated, the expression *son, the son of perdition* (υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας); certain forms of a purely Hebrew origin: *to rejoice with joy* (χαρᾷ χαίρειν), *for ever* (εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα); finally, Hebrew words changed into Greek terms, as in the formula: *Amen, amen* (ἀμήν, ἀμήν), which is found only in John.

3. The construction is *simple;* the ideas are rather placed in juxtaposition, than organically fitted together after the manner of Greek construction. This peculiar feature is especially observed in some striking examples (i. 10; ii. 9; iii. 19; vi. 22–24; viii. 32; xvii. 25), where it would not have been difficult to compose a truly syntactical sentence, as a Greek writer certainly would have done. With this altogether Hebraic form are also closely connected the very frequent *anacolutha*, according to which the dominant idea is first placed at the beginning by means of an absolute substantive, and then repeated afterwards by a pronoun construed in accordance with the rules; comp. vi. 39; vii. 38; xvii. 2. We know that these cases are still more frequent in the Apocalypse.

4. Notwithstanding the abundance of particles belonging to the Greek language, the author only makes use of *now* (δέ), more frequently of *and* (καί), *then* (οὖν), and *as* (ὡς or καθώς). Μέν, which is so common, is almost unknown in his work. I think that it appears only once (xix. 24). The

and and *then* take the place of the *vav* conversive which is, in some sort, the only Hebrew particle. The *then* sets forth the providential necessity which in the author's view binds the facts together. The *and* is frequently used in cases where we should expect the particle of opposition *but;* thus: "The light shines in the darkness, *and* the darkness apprehended it not" (i. 5); or again: "And they have seen *and* have hated both me and my Father" (xv. 24). "We speak that which we know, *and* ye receive not our testimony" (iii. 11). Luthardt acutely observes that this form is the sign of a mind which has risen above the first emotion of surprise or indignation produced by an unforeseen result, and which has come to contemplate it for the future with the calmness of indifference, or with a grief which has no bitterness. The use of the particle *as* (comp. for example, chap. xvii.) is inspired by the necessity of setting forth the analogies; this feature is one of the most characteristic ones of the mind which created this style. This tendency goes even so far as to identify the earthly symbols of divine things with these latter: "I *am* the true vine; I *am* the good shepherd." To the eyes of him who writes thus, the reality is not the earthly phenomenon, but the divine, invisible fact; the sensible phenomenon is the copy.

The author also very frequently uses the conjuction *in order that* (*iva*) in a weakened sense, and one which, as it seems, is tantamount to the simple notion of the Latin *ita ut, so that;* nevertheless, we think, with Meyer, that this is only apparently the case. The question in these cases is of a *divine* purpose. And here also there is revealed a peculiarity of the author's turn of mind: the teleological tendency, which belongs to the spirit of sacred historiography. That which, to the eyes of men, seems only an historical *result*, appears, from a more elevated point of view, as the realization of the design of God.

5. A singular contrast is observed in the narrative forms. On the one hand, something *slow*, diffuse,—for example, that form so frequent in the dialogues: "He answered and said;" or the repetition of proper names, John, Jesus, where a Greek writer would have used the pronoun (a thing which also appertains to the oriental stamp of style: Winer, Gram. N. T., § 65); or again that dragging construction, in virtue of which, after the statement of a fact, a participle with its dependent words comes in unexpectedly, with the purpose of bringing out in a clearer light one of the aspects of the fact mentioned (comp. i. 12; iii. 13; v. 18; vi. 71; vii. 50); or finally, instead of the finite verb, the heavier form of the verb *to be* joined with a participle, a form which, in certain cases, is undoubtedly founded on reasons, as in the classical style, but which is too frequently employed here not to be, as Thiersch has observed, a reproduction of the analogous form belonging to the Aramaic language;—and on the other hand, the frequent appearance of short clauses which break the sentence as if by an abrupt interruption: "And Barabbas was a robber" (xviii. 40); "now it was night" (xiii. 30); "it was the tenth hour" (i. 40); "it was the Sabbath" (v. 9); "Jesus loved Martha and Mary" (xi. 5); "Jesus wept" (xi. 35). Here are jets of an internal fire which, by its sudden outbursts,

breaks the habitual calmness of serene contemplation. Such indeed is the Semite; an exciting recollection may draw him all at once out of the majestic repose with which he ordinarily thinks it fit to envelop himself.

6. In the manner in which the ideas are connected together, we remark three characteristic features: Either, as we have seen, a brief, summary word is placed as a centre, and around it is unrolled a series of cycles, which exhaust more and more, even to its most concrete applications, the primary thought. Or there is a whole series of propositions without external connection, as in the first twenty verses of chap. xv., which all follow one another by *asyndeton;* it seems as if each thought had its whole value in itself and deserved to be weighed separately. Or, finally, there is a bond of a peculiar nature which results from the repetition, in the following clause, of one of the principal words of the preceding, for example, x. 11; xiii. 20; xvii. 2, 3, 9, 11, 15, 16; and, above all, i. 1–5. Each clause is, thus, like a ring linked with the preceding ring. The first two forms are repugnant to the Hellenic genius, the third is borrowed from the Old Testament (Psalm cxxi., and Gen. i. 1 ff.).

7. We have already called attention to the figurative character of the style; let us here add its profoundly *symbolic* character; thus the expressions *to draw, to teach,* in speaking of God; *to see, to hear,* in speaking of the relation of Christ to the invisible world; *to be hungry, thirsty,* in the spiritual sense. It is always the oriental and especially the Hebraic stamp.

8. We will only cite two more features; the *parallelism* of the clauses, which is known to be the distinctive mark of the poetic style among the Hebrews, and the *refrain,* which is likewise in use among them. At all times when the feeling of the one who speaks is elevated, or his soul is stirred by the contemplation of a lofty truth to which he is bearing testimony, these two forms appear in the Old Testament. It is exactly the same in John. For the parallelism, see iii. 11; v. 37; vi. 35, 55, 56; xii. 44, 45; xiii. 16; xv. 20; xvi. 28; for the refrain, iii. 15, 16; vi. 39, 40, 44; comp. Gen. i.: "And the evening was," etc.; Amos i. and ii.; and elsewhere, especially in the Psalms.

What judgment shall we pass, then, on the style and literary character of this work? On the one hand, Renan tells us: "This style has nothing that is Hebraic, nothing Jewish, nothing Talmudic." And he is right, if by style we understand only the wholly external forms of the language. We do not find in the fourth Gospel, as in certain parts of Luke (in the first two chapters, for example, after i. 5), Hebraisms, properly so called, imported just as they are into the Greek text (thus the *vav* conversive), nor, as in the translation of the LXX., Hebrew terms of expression roughly Hellenized. On the other hand, a scholar, who has no less profoundly studied the genius of the Semitic languages, Ewald, expresses himself thus: "No language can be, in respect to the spirit and breath which animate it, more purely Hebraic than that of our author." And he is equally right, if we consider the internal qualities of the style; the whole of the preceding examination has sufficiently proved this.

In the language of John, the clothing only is Greek, the body is Hebrew;

or, as Luthardt says, there is a Hebrew soul in the Greek language of this evangelist. Keim has devoted to the style of the fourth Gospel a beautiful page; he sees in it "the ease and flexibility of the purest Hellenism adapted to the Hebraic mode of expression, with all its candor, its simplicity, its wealth of imagery, and sometimes, also, its awkwardness. No studied refinement, no pathos; everything in it is simple and flowing as in life; but everywhere at the same time, acuteness, variety, progress, scarcely indicated features which form themselves into a picture in the mind of the reflective reader. Everywhere mysteries which surround you and are on the watch for you, signs and symbols which we should not take in the literal sense, if the author had not affirmed their reality, accidents and small details which are found, all at once, to be full of meaning; cordiality, calmness, harmony; in the midst of struggles, grief, zeal, anger, irony; finally, at the end, at the farewell meal, on the cross, and in the resurrection, peace, victory, grandeur."

From this study of the historiographical, theological and literary characteristics of our Gospel, it follows:

1. That the narrative of the fourth Gospel bears, both with respect to the facts, and the discourses, the seal of historical trustworthiness.

2. That, while marking the advance of the Gospel beyond the religion of the Old Testament, it affirms the complete harmony of the two covenants.

3. That though Greek in its forms, the style is, nevertheless, Hebrew in its substance.

BOOK THIRD.

THE ORIGIN OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

We come to the principal subject of this study, the mode of composition of the work which occupies our attention. This subject includes the following four points: 1. The *epoch* at which this book was composed; 2. The *author* to whom it is to be attributed; 3. The *place* where it had its origin; 4. The *purpose* which presided over its composition.

The means which we have at command for resolving these various questions are, besides the indications contained in the work itself, the information which we draw from the remains of the religious literature of the second century, from the canonical collections of the churches of that epoch, and from the facts of the primitive history of Christianity.

The remains of the literature of the second century are few in number; they resemble the fragments of a shipwreck. They are, first, the letter of *Clement* of Rome to the Church of Corinth, about the end of the first century or at the beginning of the second, and the so-called Epistle of *Barnabas*, belonging to the same period. After this come the letters of *Ignatius*, of the earlier part of the second century, provided we admit their authenticity either in whole or in part, and the letter of *Polycarp* to the Philippians, of a little later date, but with the same reservation. The *Shepherd of Hermas*, the letter to *Diognetus*, and a homily which bears the name of the Second Epistle of *Clement* follow next in order. The date of all these works is variously fixed. We come next to the writings of the Apologists about the middle of the century; *Justin Martyr* with his three principal works; *Tatian*, his disciple; *Athenagoras* with his apology, message addressed to Marcus Aurelius; *Theophilus* and his work addressed to Autolycus; *Melito* and *Apollinaris* with the few fragments which remain of their writings; finally, *Irenæus* of Lyons, *Clement* of Alexandria, and *Tertullian* of Carthage, who form the transition to the third century.

All these writers belong to the orthodox line. Parallel with them we find in the heretical line *Basilides* and his school; *Marcion;* then *Valentinus*, with his four principal disciples, *Ptolemy, Heracleon, Marcus, and Theodotus*, all of them authors of several works, some fragments of which we read in Irenæus, Clement and Hippolytus; the work of the last-mentioned author, recently discovered and entitled *Philosophumena*, is particularly important. Finally, let us mention the Jewish-Christian romance called *Clementine Homilies*.

The canonical collections of this epoch with which we are acquainted are three in number: That of the Syrian Church in the translation called *Peschito;* that of the Latin Church in the translation which bears the name of *Itala,* and the so-called fragment of *Muratori,* which represents the canon of some Italian or African Church about the middle of the second century.

It is by means of all these documents, as well as of the indications contained in the Gospel itself, that we must choose between the following four principal dates which at the present day are assigned by criticism to the composition of our Gospel.

CHAPTER FIRST.

THE TIME.

THE traditional opinion, in attributing this book to the Apostle John, by this very fact places its composition in the first century, towards the end of the apostolic age.

At the opposite extreme to this traditional date is that for which Baur, the chief of the Tübingen school, has decided. According to him, our work was composed between 160 and 170; he places its origin in special connection with the Paschal controversy which broke out at that epoch.

The disciples of Baur have gradually moved back the date of the composition as far as the period from 130 to 155: Volkmar, about 155; Zeller and Scholten, 150; Hilgenfeld, 130–140; thus, a quarter of a century, nearly, earlier than Baur thought. This arises from the fact that several of these writers place the composition of our Gospel in connection with the efflorescence of Gnosticism, about 140.

Many critics, at the present day, make a new step backward. Holtzmann believes our Gospel to be contemporaneous with the Epistle of Barnabas; Schenkel speaks of 115–120; Nicolas, Renan, Weizsäcker, Reuss, Sabatier, all regarding the fourth Gospel as a product of the school in which the Johannean traditions were preserved at Ephesus, fix its composition in the first quarter of the second century. This was also the opinion of Keim, when he published, in 1867, his great work, *l'Histoire de Jésus de Nazara;* he indicated as the date the years 100–120 (p. 146), and more precisely 110–115 (p. 155). More recently, in his popular editions, he has come back to the date of Hilgenfeld (130).

Here are four situations proposed, which we must now submit to the test of facts. Shall we begin with that which is most advanced, or that which is most remote? In our preceding edition, we adopted the former of these two courses. A want of logic has been noticed in this, since, in short, the facts which speak against the earliest dates give proof *a fortiori* against the most recent ones, and yet they are not pointed out until after the discussion of the latter has already taken place.[1] This is true; but

[1] Review in the *Chrétien évangélique,* by Prof. Ch. Porret.

we have confidence enough in the logic of our readers to hope that they will themselves make this reckoning, and that when, for example, they reach, in the discussion of the date 140, a fact which proves it too late, they will not fail to add this fact to those by which the dates more recent than this had been already refuted. We continue to prefer the course which is chronologically regressive, because, as Weizsäcker has been willing to acknowledge, it gives more interest to the exposition of the facts. On the progressive path, every fact giving proof in favor of an earlier date renders the discussion respecting the more recent dates unnecessary.

160–170.—(Baur).

Eusebius declared, in the first part of the fourth century, "that the Gospel of John, well-known in all the churches which are under heaven must be received as in the first rank" (Hist. Eccl., iii. 24); and he consequently reckoned it among the writings which he calls Homologoumena, that is to say, universally adopted by the churches and their teachers. When speaking thus, he had before his eyes the entire literature of the preceding centuries collected together in the libraries of his predecessor Pamphilus, at Cæsarea, and of the bishop Alexander, at Jerusalem. This declaration proves that in studying these writings he had found no gap in the testimonies establishing the use of our Gospel by the Fathers and the churches of the first three centuries. It is necessary to recall to mind here with what exactness and what frankness Eusebius mentions the least indications of a wavering in opinion with regard to the Biblical writings; for example, he does not fail to mark the omission of any citation from the Epistle to the Hebrews in the principal work of Irenæus (an omission which we can ourselves also verify), although that epistle takes rank, according to him, among the fourteen epistles of St. Paul. Let us suppose that he had found in the patristic literature up to the date 160–170 an entire blank in relation to the existence and use of our Gospel, would he have been able in all good faith to express himself as he does in the passage quoted?

Origen, about 220, places the Gospel of John in the number of the four "which are alone received without dispute in the Church of God which is under heaven" (Euseb. H. E., vi. 25). Would this place have been thus unanimously accorded to it, if it had been known only after 170?

Undoubtedly, Eusebius and Origen are not the bearers of the tradition; but they are the founders of criticism who grouped the information from the preceding centuries and evolved from it the preceding summations of the case.

Clement of Alexandria, the master of Origen, is already in a little different position; he collected the items of information which were transmitted to him by the presbyters whose line of succession is connected with the apostles (ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνέκαθεν πρεσβυτέρων). In speaking thus, he is thinking especially of Pantænus, a missionary in India, who died in 189. The following is the information which had come to him through those venerable witnesses: "John received the first three Gospels, and observing that the

corporeal things (the external facts) of our Lord's life had been recorded therein, he, being urged by the prominent men of the Church, wrote a spiritual Gospel" (Euseb. H. E., vi. 14). Could Clement, who wrote about 190, have spoken thus of a work which had been in existence only twenty or twenty-five years? He must, for this to be so, have invented this tradition himself. Let us add that in another passage (*Strom.* iii., p. 465), when quoting a saying of Jesus contained in an uncanonical gospel, called the Gospel of the Egyptians, he makes this reservation: "that we do not find this saying *in the four Gospels which have been transmitted to us*" (*ἐν τοῖς παραδεδομένοις ἡμῖν τέτταρσιν εὐαγγελίοις*). The contrast which Clement here establishes, clearly shows that, from the standpoint of tradition, there was a radical difference between the Gospel of John and a gospel such as that of the Egyptians.

Tertullian, born about 160, frequently cites our Gospel as being an authority in the whole Church. Would this be possible if this Father and this work were born in the same year, the one in Asia, the other in Africa? Let us notice that he quotes it according to a Latin translation of which he says (*Ad. Prax.*): "It is in use among our people (*In usu est nostrorum*)." And not only was it in use and so held in respect, that Tertullian did not feel free to turn aside from it, even when he was not in accord with it,[1] but also this Latin translation had already taken the place of another earlier one of which Tertullian says (*De Monogam*, c. 11) "that it has fallen into disuse (*In usum exiit*)." And yet all this could have occurred between the birth of this Father and the time when he wrote!

Irenæus wrote in Gaul, about 185, his great work *Against Heresies*. More than sixty times he quotes our Gospel in it with the most complete conviction of its apostolic origin. He who acts thus respecting it was born in Asia Minor about the year 130, and had spent his youth there in the school of Polycarp, the friend and disciple of St. John. How could he, without bad faith, have dated from the apostolic age a Gospel which had not been in existence more than fifteen to twenty years at the moment when he was writing, and which he had never heard spoken of in the churches where he had spent his youth and which must have been the cradle of this work? In 177, Irenæus drew up, on the part of the churches of Vienne and Lyons, a letter to the churches of Asia and Phrygia, for the purpose of giving them an account of the terrible persecution which had just smitten them under Marcus Aurelius. This letter has been preserved to us by Eusebius (H. E., v. 1). It says, speaking of one of the martyrs, "Having the Paraclete within him;" and in another place: "Thus was the word uttered by our Lord fulfilled, that the time shall come when he who killeth you will think that he doeth God service." These are two quotations from John (xiv. 26 and xvi. 2). Thus, about ten years after the time of composition indicated by Baur, quotations were taken *in Gaul* from our Gospel as if from a writing possessing canonical authority!

About 180, Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, addresses to his heathen

[1] Rönsch, *Das Sprachidiom der urchristlichen Itala und der catholischen Vulgata*, 1869, pp. 2-4.

friend Autolycus an apology for Christianity; he quotes in it the prologue of John, expressing himself thus (ii. 22): "This is what *the holy writings* and all the men animated by the spirit teach us, *among whom John says*" (John i. 1 follows). Can it be admitted, that only fifteen to twenty years after the appearance of our Gospel, the bishop of Antioch spoke in this way? He so fully placed it in the rank of the other three, which were received everywhere and at all times, that he had published a *Harmony* of the Gospels, which Jerome describes to us (*De Vir.* 25) as "uniting in a single work the words of the four Gospels (*quatuor evangeliorum in unum opus dicta compingens*)." The adversaries of the authenticity bring forward the circumstance, it is true, that here is the first instance in which the author of our Gospel is designated by name. But what does so accidental a fact prove? Irenæus is the first ecclesiastical writer who names St. Paul as the author of the Epistle to the Romans. Would it be necessary to conclude, from this fact, that the belief in the apostolic authorship of the Epistle to the Romans began only at that moment to dawn on the mind of the Church? As it was not up to that time the custom to quote textually, so also it was not the custom to quote with a designation of the author.

Apollinaris, bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia, about 170, contended against the opinion of persons who celebrated the Holy Passover Supper on the evening of the 14th of Nisan, at the same time that the Jews ate their Passover meal; for, as they alleged, according to the Gospel of Matthew, Jesus had eaten the Passover on that evening with His disciples, and He had not been crucified until the next day. Apollinaris made reply to this in two ways:[1] 1. That this view "was in contradiction to the law;" since, according to the law, the Paschal lamb was slain on the 14th, and not on the 15th; it was consequently on that day that the Christ must die; 2. That if this view was well founded, "the Gospels would contradict each other." This second remark can only refer to the account in the Gospel of John, which places the death of Jesus on the 14th, and not the 15th, as the Synoptics appear to do. Thus, in 170, Apollinaris rested upon the fourth Gospel as on a perfectly recognized authority, even on the part of his adversaries, and yet at this same epoch, according to Baur, it began to circulate as an altogether new work! This critic has endeavored, to be sure, to wrest this passage from its natural meaning; but this attempt has been unanimously discarded. Besides, the same Apollinaris in still another passage, also, adduces the fourth Gospel. He calls Jesus, "The one whose sacred side was pierced and who poured forth from His side water and blood, the word and the Spirit;"[2] comp. John xix. 34.

At the same period Melito, bishop of Sardis, wrote also on the same subject. Otto (in the *Corpus apologet.*, vol. ix.) has published a fragment from this Father, in which it is said that "Jesus, being at once perfect God and man, proved his divinity by his miracles in the *three years* which

[1] *Chronicon paschale* (ed. Dindorf I., p. 14): ὅθεν ἀσύμφωνός τε νόμῳ ἡ νόησις αὐτῶν καὶ στασιάζειν δοκεῖ κατ' αὐτοὺς τὰ εὐαγγέλια.

[2] *Chron. pasch.*, p. 14.

followed his baptism, and his humanity during the thirty years which preceded it." Those three years of ministry can come only from the Johannean narration.

About the same time (in 176), Athenagoras thus expresses himself in his apology addressed to the Emperor Marcus Aurelius: "The Son of God is the Word of the Father; by him all things were made." Here is an undeniable quotation; Volkmar himself acknowledges it.

There is the same use of the fourth Gospel on the part of the *heretics* of this period, particularly on the part of the disciples of Valentinus. One of them, Ptolemy (in a fragment preserved by Irenæus), recalled in these words the passage in John xii. 27: "Jesus said: And what shall I say? I know not." He maintained (also according to Irenæus) that the Apostle John himself had taught at the beginning of his Gospel the existence of the first Ogdoad (the foundation of the doctrine of Valentinus). Irenæus and Epiphanius have preserved for us his letter to Flora, in which he cites John i. 3 in these words: "The apostle declares that the creation of the world belongs to the Saviour, inasmuch as all things were made by him and nothing was made without him." In the fragments of Theodotus preserved in the works of Clement of Alexandria, there are found seventy-eight quotations from the New Testament, of which number twenty-six are taken from the Gospel of John.[1] The fact most important to be cited here is the commentary which Heracleon wrote on the fourth Gospel. At what time? About the year 200, Volkmar asserts; but Origen, who refuted this work, calls its author *a familiar acquaintance* of Valentinus (Οὐαλεντίνου γνώριμος); now the latter taught between 140 and 160. Yes, replies Volkmar, but Heracleon is not at all mentioned by Irenæus, which proves that he lived after 185, the date at which the latter wrote against the heretics of his time. This assertion is, as Tischendorf has shown, an error of fact arising simply from the omission of the name of Heracleon in the registers of names in the editions of Massuet and Stieren, at the end of Irenæus' work. In fact, this Father expressly says ii. 4: "and all the other Æons of Ptolemy and *Heracleon*." This latter person lived and wrote, therefore, before Irenæus—at the latest, about 170 or even 160. And what did he write? A continuous commentary on the Gospel of John. This single fact implies that our Gospel enjoyed in the Church at that period an authority which was of long standing and general. For men do not comment except on a book which, up to a certain point, gives law to every one. How long a time must have elapsed, therefore, since this work was composed! Moreover, Irenæus (iii. 12, 12), testifies that the Valentinians "made abundant use of the Gospel of John" (*eo quod est secundum Johannem plenissime utentes*).

The Clementine Homilies which are located about the year 160,[2] express themselves thus (iii. 52): "This is the reason why the true prophet has said: I am the gate of life (ἡ πύλη τῆς ζωῆς); he who enters through me enters into life . . . My sheep hear my voice (τὰ ἐμὰ πρόβατα ἀκούει τῆς

[1] Hofstede de Groot, *Basilides*, p. 102.

[2] Keim himself, I., p. 137.

ἐμῆς φωνῆς)." This is an evident quotation from John x. 3, 9, 27; but it is not enough to make Baur, Scholten, Volkmar, Hilgenfeld, etc., admit the use of the Johannean Gospel by the vehement Judaizing writer who composed this pamphlet against the doctrine and person of St. Paul. The discovery made by Dressel, in 1853, of the end of this book as yet unknown, was needed to cut short all critical subterfuges. In the nineteenth homily, chap. xxii., there is found this unquestionable quotation from the story of the man born blind related in the ninth chapter of John: "This is the reason why our Lord also replied to those who asked him: Did this man sin, or his parents, that he was born blind?—Neither did this man sin nor his parents, but that through him might be manifested the power of God healing the faults of ignorance." The slight modification which the author of the *Homilies* introduces into the last words of this Johannean saying is connected with the particular idea which he is endeavoring to make prominent in this passage. If Volkmar finds herein a reason for denial even in the presence of such a quotation, Hilgenfeld, on the contrary, frankly says (*Einl.*, p. 734): "The Gospel of John is employed without scruple even by the adversaries of the divinity of Christ, such as the author of the Clementines." What, then, must have been the authority of a book which even the adversaries of the teaching contained in the work used in this way! Here is what occurred in 160, and yet Baur tries to maintain that this work was composed between 160 and 170!

A heathen philosopher, Celsus, wrote a book entitled *The True Word* (λόγος ἀληθής), to controvert Christianity; he wished, he said, to slay the Christians "with their own sword," that is to say, to refute Christianity by the writings of the very disciples of its founder. He started in his work, therefore, from the universally acknowledged authenticity of our Gospels. Did he make use of the fourth Gospel also with this purpose? Certainly; for he recalls the demand which the Jews addressed to Jesus in the temple to prove by a sign that He was the Son of God (John ii. 18). He compares the water and the blood which flowed from the body of Jesus on the cross (John xix., 34), to that sacred blood which the mythological stories made to flow from the body of the blessed gods. He speaks of the appearance to Mary Magdalene (that πάροιστρος woman) near the sepulchre. He sets forth this contradiction between our Gospel narratives, that, according to some (οἱ μέν), two angels appeared at the tomb of Jesus, according to the others (οἱ δέ), on the contrary, only one. And in fact Matthew and Mark speak of only one angel, Luke and John mention two. The use of John in this passage, which Zeller still ventured to deny, is now acknowledged by Volkmar himself, but this avowal ends, as usual, in a subterfuge: "And who tells us that Celsus wrote before the beginning of the third century?" And by means of a passage of Origen the purport of which is incorrectly given, the attempt is made to prove that that Father spoke of Celsus as his contemporary.[1] Tischendorf has done full justice to this procedure. It was enough for him to quote Origen correctly, in

[1] *Ursprung uns. Evang.*, p. 80.

order to show that he said nothing of the sort. He has, in addition, recalled another passage of this Father, where he expressly designates Celsus as "a man already and long since dead (ἤδη καὶ πάλαι νεκροῦ)."[1] If we adopt the latest date for the work of Celsus, that of Keim (in 178), it still remains impossible that a heathen should have held a work published only eight years before to be composed by one of the disciples of Jesus. And how will it be if Celsus lived much earlier?

There remain to us three documents of the canonical collections of apostolic writings, already existing in the churches of the second century. In Syria, about the end of this century, a translation of the New Testament in the Syriac language was read, and our fourth Gospel certainly formed a part of it, for the only books of the New Testament which were wanting in this collection were, according to unquestionable data, four of the Catholic epistles and the Apocalypse. It even appears, from several fragments in the Syriac language which Cureton has published, that this translation which is called *Peschito*, and which contained the Old Testament as well as the New, had been already preceded by another more ancient one.[2] At the same period, at the opposite extremity of the Church, in Italy, in Gaul, and in the province of Africa, the Latin translation already existed of which we have spoken in connection with Tertullian. In this canonical collection, which also contained the Old Testament, the writings of the New Testament seem to have been divided into five groups: 1. The body of the four Gospels, *the evangelical instrument*, collection of documents; then, *the apostolical instruments*, to wit: 2. That of the Acts; 3. That of Paul; 4. That of John (Apocalypse and 1 John); 5. A group of disputed writings (1 Peter, Hebrews, Jude). Is it possible to suppose that in the last quarter of the second century, a work which did not appear until between 160 and 170, had already been translated into Syriac and into Latin, and had become possessed of canonical dignity in countries which, so to speak, formed the antipodes of the Church?

The famous document which was recovered in the last century by Muratori in the Library of Milan, and which bears the name of that scholar, is located between 160 and 170. It is a treatise on the writings which were said to have been read publicly in the churches. The author indicates in it the custom of the Church of Italy or of Africa to which he belongs. The Gospel of John is mentioned in it as the fourth. The author gives an account in detail of the manner in which it was composed by the Apostle John, and brings out some of its peculiarities. This is what was written in Italy or in Africa at the very date which Baur assigns to the composition of this Gospel!

It will not be surprising to any one, after the enumeration of these facts, that the so-called *critical* school has judged it impossible to maintain the position chosen by its master. It has effected its retreat movement throughout, and has sought, by going backward in the second century, a

[1] *Wann wurden unsere Evangelien verfasst?* pp. 73, 74.

[2] *Remains of a very ancient recension*, etc.; London, 1858.

more tenable situation. Before we follow it, let us note the fact that between 160 and 170 the fourth Gospel existed in the Greek, Latin and Syriac languages, and that it was publicly read in all the churches, from Mesopotamia even to Gaul. Facts like these imply, not only two or three decades of years, but at the least a half century of existence.

(130–155.)

Volkmar, 155; Zeller, Scholten, 150; Hilgenfeld, 130–140; Keim (since 1875), 130.

Instead of the fifty years which we ask for in order to explain the facts which we have just mentioned, only twenty or thirty are granted us. Let us see whether this concession is sufficient to account for the facts which we have yet to point out. Our means for guiding our course in the examination of this new date are the writings of Justin Martyr, the Montanist movement, and the two great Gnostic systems of Marcion and Valentinus.

Justin, born in Samaria, had traversed the Orient and then had come to Rome to establish a school of Christian instruction, about 140. There remain to us three generally acknowledged works of his: the *greater* and *smaller Apology*, which, since the labors of Volkmar, are ordinarily regarded as dating, the first from 147; the second, a supplement to the first, from one of the succeeding years; they are addressed to the emperor and the senate. The third work is the *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew;* it is the account of a public debate held at Ephesus. It is a little later than the Apologies. Justin was put to death in 166.

In these three works the author cites seventeen times, as the source of the facts of Jesus' history which are alleged by him, writings entitled, *Memoirs of the Apostles* (ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων),[1] and the decisive question, in the matter which occupies us, will be whether the fourth Gospel was in the number of the writings comprised in this collection.

In order to understand the importance of the question here proposed, we must recall to mind the fact that the writings cited by Justin as his authorities were not only his private property. According to the famous passage of the first Apology (i. 67), in which Justin describes the worship of the Christians in the first half of the second century, the Memoirs of the Apostles were read every Sunday in the public assemblies of the Church, side by side with the books of the prophets;[2] and it is very evident that this description does not, in the writer's thought, apply only to the worship celebrated by the Church of Rome, but to that of Christendom generally; this follows from the expressions used by him: "*All those who dwell in the towns and in the country* meet together in one place." Justin

[1] *Apol.* i. 33: 66; 67; *Dial.*, 88; 101; 102; 103 (twice); 104; 105 (3 times); 106 (3 times).

[2] "On the day called the day of the Sun, all those who dwell in the towns and in the country meet together in one place, and the Memoirs of the Apostles and the writings of the prophets are read, according as the time permits; afterwards . . ."

had visited Asia Minor and Egypt; he knew, therefore, how the worship was celebrated, as well in the East as in the West. Moreover, he defended before the emperor, not only the Christians of Rome, but the Church in general. Consequently, what he says in this passage of the celebration of public worship, and in several others of that of baptism (*Apol.* i. 61) and of the Holy Supper (*Apol.* i. 66), must be applied to the whole of the Christendom of that epoch.

What, then, were these Apostolic Memoirs which were venerated by the churches of the second century so far as to be read publicly in worship equally with the book which, according to the example of Jesus and the apostles, the Church regarded as the Divine Word, the Old Testament? Justin does not indicate to us the particular titles of these writings; it is our task to determine them.

1. First of all, let us note a probability which rises almost to certainty. We have seen above that Irenæus, who wrote thirty years after Justin (180–185), spoke, in Gaul, of our four canonical Gospels as the only ones received in the Church. This usage was already so fixed at his time, that he calls our evangelical collection the four-formed Gospel (*τετράμορφον εὐαγγέλιον*), and that he compares these four writings to the four Cherubim of the Old Covenant and to the four quarters of the horizon. They form for him an indivisible unity. Nearly at the same time, Clement, in Egypt, also calls our Gospels, as we have seen, "*the four* which alone have been *transmitted* to us" (p. 141). Theophilus, in Syria, at the same epoch, composes a Harmony of these four narratives (p. 142 f.). Finally, a little earlier still (about 160), the fragment of Muratori, enumerating the Gospels which are adopted for public reading, expresses itself thus: "*Thirdly*, the book of the Gospel according to Luke . . . ; *fourthly*, the Gospel of John . . ." Then there is nothing more with regard to writings of this kind; it passes to the Acts and Epistles. Can it be admitted that the Apostolic Memoirs, of which Justin tells us that they were generally read in the Christian worship twenty or thirty years before, were *other writings* than those which these Fathers and the churches themselves distinguished thus from all the other writings of the same kind, or that they did not, at least, make a part of the collection to which the Martyr already assigned a place in the worship by the side of the prophetic writings of the Old Testament? To this end there must necessarily have been wrought, during that short space of time, a revolution in Christian worship, a substitution of sacred writings for sacred writings, of which history does not present the least trace, and which is rendered absolutely impossible by the universality and publicity of the use of the Memoirs of which Justin speaks, and by the stability of the apostolic usages at that period. The Fathers, such as Irenæus, were at hand keeping watch over the matter, and they would not have permitted a change of the documents from which the Church derived its knowledge of the life of Jesus to be accomplished, without indicating it.

2. A special fact proves a still more direct connection between Justin, on the one side, and the Fathers of a little later date (Irenæus, etc.), on

the other. Justin had a disciple named Tatian, who had already, before Theophilus, composed a work similar to his. Eusebius tells us (*H. E.* iv. 19) that this book was entitled *Diatessaron*, that is to say, *composed by means of the four.*[1] Now, according to the report of the Syrian bishop Bar Salibi (xii. cent.), who was acquainted with this work since he quotes it in his Commentary on the Gospels, this writing began with these words of John's prologue (i. 1): "In the beginning was the Word." According to the same author, Ephrem, the well-known deacon of Edessa (died in 373), had composed a commentary on this same work of Tatian, an Armenian translation of which has been recently recovered and published (Venice, 1876). This translation confirms everything which the Fathers have reported respecting Tatian's Harmony. In a work of an apocryphal character, the *Doctrine of Addæus* (of the middle of the third century), in which the history of the establishment of Christianity at Edessa is related, it is said: "The people meet together for the service of prayer and for [the reading of] the Old Testament and [for that of the] New *in the Diatessaron.*"[2] This work of Tatian, therefore, was very widely spread abroad in the East, since it was read in the East, even in the public worship, instead of the four Gospels. This is confirmed by the report of the bishop of Cyrus, in Cilicia, Theodoret (about 420). He relates that he had found two hundred copies of Tatian's book in the churches of his diocese, and that he had substituted for this Harmony, which was heterodox in some points, "*the Gospels of the four evangelists* (*τὰ τῶν τεττάρων εὐαγγελίστων ἀντεισήγαγον εὐαγγέλια*)"—thus, our four separate Gospels, those which Tatian had combined in a single one. If we recall to mind the relation which united Tatian to Justin, the identity of the Apostolic Memoirs of the master with the *four* blended in one by the disciple cannot be doubted. Moreover, in his *Discourse to the Greeks* Tatian himself quotes Matthew, Luke and John; from the last, i. 3: "All things were made by him" (the Logos); iv. 24: "God is a spirit;" finally, i. 5, with that formula which indicates a sacred authority: "This is that which is spoken (*τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ εἰρημένον*): The darkness did not apprehend the light; . . . now the light of God is the Word."

3. But why, if it is so, does Justin designate these books by the unusual name of *Memoirs*, instead of calling them simply Gospels? Because he addresses himself, not to Christians, but to the emperor and senate, who would not have understood the Christian name of Gospels, which was without example in profane literature. Every one, on the other hand, was acquainted with the *ἀπομνημονεύματα* (*Memoirs*) of Xenophon. Justin has recourse to this ordinary name, exactly as he substitutes for the Christian terms *baptism* and *Sunday* the terms *bath* and *day of the Sun.*

[1] See also Epiphanius, *Haer.* xlvi. 1, and Theodoret, *Haer. Fab.* i. 20.

[2] In the Catena of Victor of Capua (545), the work of Tatian is called *Diapente* "*composed by means of five.*" But immediately before, the same author has described it as *unum ex quatuor.* There is, thus, here either a negligence of the author, or perhaps an allusion to quotations of Justin, which are foreign to our four Gospels, which seemed to him to imply the use of a fifth source.

Finally, Justin himself, in one of the passages where he quotes the Memoirs (*Apol.* i. 4, 66), adds expressly: "*which are composed by the apostles and called Gospels* (ἃ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια)," and, in another passage (*Dial.* 103) he expresses himself thus: "*The Memoirs which I say were composed by the apostles and by those who accompanied them*," which, whatever some critics may say, can only apply to our four Gospels, of which, as the fact is, two were composed by apostles and two by *apostolic helpers*. All the critical quibbles will not alter the evidence at all.

4. But let us, finally, consider the quotations taken by Justin from the Memoirs themselves. No one, at the present day, any longer denies the use of the three Synoptics by this Father. In 1848, Zeller conceded it with respect to Luke; in 1850, Hilgenfeld, with respect to Matthew; the same, in 1854, with respect to Mark; Credner in 1860, Volkmar in 1866, Scholten in 1867, have acknowledged it with respect to all the three. The Gospel of John remains. Keim, already in 1867 (vol. i., p. 138), wrote: "It is easy to show that the Martyr had under his eyes a whole series of Johannean passages," and Hilgenfeld said in 1875 (*Einl.* p. 734): "The first trace of the Gospel of John is found in Justin Martyr." Mangold, in the same year, formulates thus the result of all the discussions which have recently taken place respecting this point: "That Justin knew and used the fourth Gospel is certain, and it is also beyond doubt that he makes use of it as a work proceeding from the Apostle John."[1] And in fact John's doctrine of the Logos appears in all the writings of Justin; this is their fundamental peculiarity. Let us quote a single example taken from each of these writings: "His Son, the only one who may be properly called Son, the Logos who was begotten by him before created things, when he created all things by him, . . . is called Christ" (*Apol.* ii. 6). "The first power after God, the Father and Master of all, is the Son, the Word, who, having in a certain way been made flesh, became a man (ὃς τινα τρόπον σαρκοποιηθεὶς ἄνθρωπος γέγονεν)" (*Apol.* i. 32). *Dial.* 105: "Because he was the only begotten Son of the Father of all things (μονογενὴς ὅτι ἦν τῷ πατρὶ τῶν ὅλων)." The relation between Justin and John on this capital point is so evident that Volkmar has been obliged finally to acknowledge it; but he extricates himself by an expedient which not a little resembles a clown's trick. According to him, it is not Justin who has imitated John; it is a pseudo-John who, writing about 155, has imitated Justin, whose writings were in circulation since 147–150. Justin had drawn the first lineaments of the Logos theory; the false John has developed and perfected it. "But," answers Keim to this supposition, "who can seriously think of making out of the genial and original author of the fourth Gospel the disciple of a mind so mediocre, dependent, disposed to the work of compiling, and poor in style, as the Martyr?" We will add: The theology of the former is the simple expression of his religious consciousness, of the immediate effects produced on him by the person of Jesus, while, as Weizsäcker has clearly shown,[2] the characteristic trait of Justin is to serve

[1] *Gœtt. gelehrte Anzeigen*, 5 u. 12, *Jan.* 1881.

[2] *Jahrb. für deutsche Theol.*, 1867.

as an intermediary between Christian thought and the speculations which were prevailing at his epoch outside of Christianity. Justin teaches us that the Logos comes from the Father as a fire is kindled by another fire, without the latter being diminished; he explains to us that he differs from the Father in *number*, but not in *thought*, etc., etc. How can one venture to affirm that Justin surpasses John in simplicity? The truth is that John is the witness, and Justin the theologian. John's prologue—it is there only that there is any question of the Logos in our Gospel—is the primordial revelation, in its simple and apostolic form; the writings of Justin present to us the first effort to appropriate this revelation to oneself by the reason.

Besides, let us listen to Justin himself, *Dial.* 105: "I have previously shown that it was the only begotten Son of the Father of all things, his Logos and his power, born of him and afterwards made man by means of the Virgin, *as we have learned through the Memoirs.*" Justin himself tells us here from what source he had derived his doctrine of the Logos; it was from his Apostolic Memoirs. Hilgenfeld has claimed that Justin did not appeal to the Memoirs except for the second of the two facts mentioned in this passage: the miraculous birth; but the two facts indicated depend equally, through one and the same conjunction (ὅτι *that*), on the verbal ideas; *I have shown*, and *as we have learned.* Moreover, the principal notion, according to the entire context, is that of the *only begotten Son* (μονογενής) which belongs to the first of the two dependent clauses.[1] Our conclusion is expressly confirmed by what Justin says (*Dial.* 48); he speaks of certain Christians who were not in accord with him on this point, and he declares that, if he does not think as they do, it is not merely because they form only a minority in the Church, but "because it is not by human teachings that we have been brought to believe in Christ [in this way], but by the teachings of the holy prophets and by those of Christ himself (τοῖς διὰ τῶν προφητῶν κηρυχθεῖσι καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ διδαχθεῖσι)." Now, where can we find, outside of the Gospel of John, the teachings of Christ respecting His pre-existence? Comp. also *Apol.* i. 46: "That Christ is the first-born Son of God, being the Logos of whom all the human race is made participant—this is *what has been taught us* (ἐδιδάχθημεν)." We see from this *us*, which applies to Christians in general, and by the term *taught*, that Justin was by no means the author of the doctrine of the incarnation of the Logos, but that, when calling Jesus by this name, he feels himself borne along by the great current of the teaching given in the Church, and of which the source must necessarily be found in the writings, or at least in one of the writings, of the apostles of which he made use.

5. The use of our Gospel by Justin appears, finally, from several particular quotations, *Dial.* 88: "And as men supposed that he [John the Baptist] was the Christ, he himself cried out to them: I am not the Christ,

[1] This is clearly brought out by Drummond, *Theological Review* (vol. xiv. pp. 178–182, comp. Ezra Abbot, p. 43) by recalling the fact that all this development is occasioned by the expression μονογενής in Ps. xxii., of which Justin is here giving the explanation.

but I am the voice of one crying (*οὐκ εἰμὶ ὁ Χριστὸς, ἀλλὰ φωνὴ βοῶντος*)." Comp. John i. 20, 23. Hilgenfeld acknowledges this quotation. *Dial.* 69, Justin says that Jesus healed those who were blind *from birth* (*τοὺς ἐκ γενετῆς πηρούς*); the Gospel of John alone (ix. 1) attributes to Him a healing of this kind; the same term *ἐκ γενετῆς* is used by John. Another interesting passage is found in *Dial.* 88: "The apostles have written that, when Jesus came out of the water, the Holy Spirit shone above him like a dove." This is the only case where Justin uses the expression, *the apostles have written.* It evidently applies to the two Gospels of Matthew and *John. Dial.* 29, Justin proves that Christians are no more bound to the Jewish Sabbath, and he does this by calling to mind the fact that God governs the world on that day as well as on the others. In c. 27, he also points out the fact that infants are circumcised on the eighth day, even though it falls upon a Sabbath (*κἂν ᾖ ἡμέρα τῶν σαββάτων*). We easily recognize here the relation to John v. 17 and vii. 22, 23. *Apol.* i. 52, Justin quotes the words of Zach. xii. 10: "They shall look on Him whom they pierced (*καὶ τότε ὄψονται εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν*)." In this form it differs both from the terms of the Hebrew text ("they shall look *on me* whom they . . . ") and from that of the LXX: "They shall look on me because they have mocked me." Now we read this same passage in the fourth Gospel exactly in the form in which Justin quotes it (John xix.): *ὄψονται εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν.* Some think, no doubt, that Justin may have derived this passage from the book of the Apocalypse, where it is likewise quoted, i. 7: "And every eye shall see Him, and they also who pierced Him." But Justin's text is more closely connected with that of the Gospel. Other grounds are alleged, it is true, such as the possibility of an ancient variation of text in the LXX.;[1] we shall, therefore, not insist much upon this fact.

Here, on the other hand, is an important, and even decisive passage. *Apol.* i. 61, Justin relates to the senate that when a man has been convinced of the truth of the Gospel, "he is led to a place where there is water, to be regenerated like the believers who (have) preceded him; and that he is bathed in the water in the name of God, the Father and Lord of all things, and of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit;" for Christ said: "Unless ye are born again (*ἂν μὴ ἀναγεννηθῆτε*), ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. Now that it is impossible," continues Justin, "for those who have once been born to enter again into the womb of those who gave them birth, is evident to all." The relation to John iii. 3–5 is manifest; it appears especially from the last words, which reproduce, without any sort of necessity and in the most clumsy way, the meaning of the objection of Nicodemus in John's narrative (ver. 4). Many, however, deny that Justin wrote thus under the influence of John's narrative. They allege these two differences: instead of the term employed by John, *ἄνωθεν γεννηθῆναι* (*to be born from above* or *anew*), Justin says *ἀναγεννηθῆναι* (*to be born again*); then, for the expression *Kingdom of God,* he substitutes *Kingdom of heaven.* But these two changes do not have the importance

[1] See Abbott himself, p. 46.

which some critics attribute to them. As to the first, Abbot proves that it is found also in Irenæus, Eusebius, Athanasius, Basil, Ephrem, Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, Anastasius Sin., as well as in most of the Latin authorities (*renasci*), all of whom made use of the Gospel of John and yet quote this passage as Justin does. Undoubtedly, it is because the term ἀνωθεν γεννηθῆναι was obscure, and subject to discussion, and because it is read only once in the Scriptures, while the other is clearer and more common (1 Pet. i. 3, 23; ii. 2). As to the expression *Kingdom of heaven*, it arises in Justin evidently from the Gospel of Matthew, which, from a mass of proofs, was much the most read in the earliest times of the Church, and in which this term is habitually employed. Abbot proves that this same change occurs in the quotation of this passage in the Greek and Latin Fathers, all of whom had John in their hands. But the following is a more serious objection, namely: that this same saying of Jesus is found quoted in the *Clementine Homilies* (ix. 26) with precisely the same alterations as in Justin, which seems to prove that the two authors borrowed from a common source other than John; for example, from the Gospel of the Hebrews. Here is the passage from the *Clementines;* the reader can judge: "This is what the true prophet has affirmed to us with an oath: Verily I say unto you that unless you are born again of living water (ἐὰν μὴ ἀναγεννηθῆτε ὕδατι ζῶντι), in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, you shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." We see that the difference between Justin and the *Clementines*, as Abbot says, is much greater than that between these two works and John. The reason is, because the text of the *Clementines* is influenced not only, like that of Justin, by Matt. xviii. 3, but especially by Matt. xxviii. 19 (the formula of baptism).[1]

Let us, finally, recall a quotation from the first Epistle of John which is found in Justin. *Dial.* c. 123, he says: "All at once we are called to become sons of God, and we are so," which recalls 1 John iii. 1 (according to the reading adopted at the present day by many critics): "Behold, what love God has had for us, that we should be called children of God; and we are so." Hilgenfeld acknowledges this quotation.

How is it conceivable that, in the face of all these facts, Reuss can express himself thus (p. 94): "We conclude that Justin did not include the fourth Gospel among those which he cites generally under the name of Memoirs of the Apostles." What argument, then, is powerful enough to neutralize to his view the value of the numerous quotations which we have just alleged? "Justin," he says, "did not have recourse to our Gospel, as would have been expected, when he wished to establish the historical facts of which he was desirous to avail himself." But do we not know that there is nothing more deceptive in criticism than arguments

[1] The author of the *Recognitions* quotes thus: "Amen dico vobis, nisi quis denuo renatus fuerit ex aqua, non introibit in regna cœlorum." He quotes, combining the third and fifth verses of John; he only omits the expression *and of the Spirit*, to the end of glorifying so much the more the baptism of water, in conformity with the ritual tendency of that time.

drawn from what a writer should have said or done, and has not done or said? Abbot cites curious examples of this drawn from contemporary history. We have already recalled to mind the fact that the Gospel of Matthew was, in the earliest times of the Church, the source which was most generally used. This is also the case with Justin, who uses Luke much less frequently than Matthew, and Mark much less even than Luke. John is used more than Mark.[1]

For ourselves, we think we have proved: 1. That the fourth Gospel existed in the time of Justin and formed a part of his apostolic Memoirs; 2. That it was publicly read in the churches of the East and West as one of the authentic documents of the history and teachings of Jesus; 3. That, as a consequence, it possessed already at that period, conjointly with the other three, a very ancient notoriety and a general authority equal to that of the Old Testament. Now it is impossible that a work which held this position in the Church in 140, should have been composed only about the year 130.[2]

In the same year 140, when Justin came to settle at Rome, there also arrived in that city one of the most illustrious representatives of the Gnostic doctrines, Valentinus. After having carried on a school for quite a long time in that capital, he went away to end his career in Cyprus, about 160. We already know some of his principal disciples, Ptolemy, Heracleon, Theodotus, and we know how much favor the fourth Gospel had in their schools; history confirms this saying of Irenæus respecting them: "making use, in the most complete way, of the Gospel of John." It is, therefore, very probable that their master had given them an example on this point. Tertullian sets Valentinus in opposition to another Gnostic, Marcion, remarking that the former accepted the sacred collection as a whole, not making up the Scriptures according to his doctrine, but rather adapting his doctrine to the Scriptures.[3] We are acquainted with his system; he presented as emanating successively from the eternal and divine abyss pairs of Æons (principles of things), of which the first four formed what he called the *Ogdoad* (the sacred eight). The names of these Æons were: *Logos, Light, Truth, Grace, Life, Only begotten Son, Par-*

[1] The other general objections which are raised by A. Thoma in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift* (1875), and by the work called *Supernatural Religion*, are refuted by Abbot (pp. 61–76). They do not concern us here, since Thoma himself admits that Justin was acquainted with and in almost every chapter used "the Gospel of the Logos;" he only claims that he did not recognize it as apostolic and truly historical. This is of little importance to us, since the question here is only whether the Gospel existed in Justin's time and was used by him.—As to the question whether the few facts of the evangelical history cited by Justin, which are not found in our Gospels, are borrowed from the oral tradition or from some lost work, the Gospel of the Hebrews for example, we have no reason to occupy ourselves with it here.

[2] To Justin is sometimes ascribed the *Letter to Diognetus*, in which the fourth Gospel has left its deeply marked imprint. In our view, as in that of Reuss, this letter must date approximatively from the year 130. But, independently of those who, like Overbeck, bring it down to the fourth century, others place it only under Marcus Aurelius, in the second half of the century. Comp. Draeseke, *Jahrb. für protest. Theol.*, 2 Heft., 1881. Under these conditions, we refrain from alleging the passages or expressions which are borrowed from John.

[3] *De praescr. haeret*, ch. 38.

aclete. The influence of John's prologue is easily recognized here, since all these names are found united together in that passage, with the exception of the last, which appears only later in the Gospel, and which is used in the epistle. It has been asked, it is true, whether perhaps it may not be the evangelist who composed his prologue under the influence of the Valentinian Gnosis, and Hilgenfeld has thought that his aim may have been to cause this new doctrine to penetrate the Church, by mitigating it. We have already seen to what forced interpretations (of John viii. 44, for example, and other passages), this scholar has been led from this point of view. Let us add that the terms by which Valentinus designates his Æons receive in his system an artificial, strained, mythological sense, while in the prologue of John they are taken in their simple, natural and, moreover, Biblical meaning; for they, all of them, belong already to the language of the Old Testament. It certainly is not John who has transformed the divine actors of the Gnostic drama into simple religious ideas; it is very evidently the reverse which has taken place: "Everything leads us to hold," says Bleek, "that the Gnostics made use of these expressions, which they drew from a work which was held in esteem, as points of support for their speculative system." "John," says Keim in the same line, "knows nothing of those Æons, of that Pleroma, of those masculine and feminine pairs, and of all that long line of machinery which was designed to bring God into the finite; it is he, therefore, undoubtedly, who is the earliest, and who, as Irenæus indicates, laid the foundation of the edifice." Hilgenfeld claims that the Logos of John is only a concentration of the series of Æons of Valentinus. Hase replies to him, that we can maintain, and with as good right at least, that it is the single Logos of John which was divided by the Gnostics into their series of Æons. In the *Philosophumena* (vi. 35), Hippolytus relates of Valentinus the following: "*He says* (φησί) that all the prophets and the law spoke according to the Demiurge, the senseless god, and that this is the reason why the Saviour said: "All those who came before me are thieves and robbers." This is an express quotation from John x. 8. Criticism replies: Perhaps it was not Valentinus himself who expressed himself thus, but one of his successors. Let us admit it, notwithstanding the very positive words *He says* of Hippolytus. The Ogdoad, with its Johannean names, which form the basis of the whole Valentinian system, remains nevertheless; and it would be very strange that the chief of the school should not have been the one who laid the foundation of the system. We do not think, therefore, that an impartial criticism can deny in the case of Valentinus himself the use of the fourth Gospel.[1]

Two years before Valentinus, in 138, Marcion arrived in Rome; he came

[1] The following is what Heinrici says in his well-known work, *Die Valentinianische Gnosis und die heilige Schrift:* "The Valentinians thus used the Scripture as a universally recognized authority; it possessed this authority, therefore, previously to the appearance of the system. The use which the Valentinians made of the Gospel of John and the Epistles to the Colossians and the Ephesians proves that these writings were recognized and used as apostolic writings already in the first half of the second century."

from Pontus, where his father was bishop, and where he had been brought up in the Christian beliefs. Tertullian makes an allusion to his Christian past, when he apostrophizes him thus (*De carne Christi*, c. 2): "Thou who, when thou wert a Christian, didst fall away, rejecting that which thou hadst formerly believed, as thou dost acknowledge in a certain letter." To what did this rejection (*rescindendo*) with which Tertullian reproaches him, and which had attended upon his spiritual falling away, refer? The answer is given us by two other passages from the same Father. In the work specially designed to refute the doctrines of Marcion, Tertullian relates (*Adv. Marc.* iv. 3), that Marcion, "in studying the Epistle to the Galatians, discovered that Paul charged the apostles with not *walking in the truth*, and that he took advantage of this charge to destroy the confidence which men had in the Gospels published under the name of the apostles and apostolic men, and to claim belief on behalf of his own Gospel which he substituted for these." We know, indeed, that Marcion had selected by preference the Gospel of Luke, and that, after having mutilated it in order to adapt it to his system, he gave it to his churches as the rule of their faith. Now, what does the conclusion which he drew from Galatians ii. prove? The apostles mentioned in that chapter are Peter and John. If Marcion inferred from that passage the rejection of *their* Gospels, it must be that he had in his hands a Gospel of Peter—was this Mark?—and a Gospel of John. He rejected from this time those books of the Canon which had been handed down to him by his father, the bishop of Sinope. In the *De carne Christi*, chap. 3, we read a second expression which leads to the same result as the preceding: "If thou hadst not *rejected* the writings which are contrary to thy system, the Gospel of John would be there to convince thee." In order that Marcion should reject this writing, it certainly must have been in existence, and Marcion must have previously possessed it. And let us notice, that he rejected it, not on the ground that it was not apostolic; but, on the contrary, that it was so. For to his thought the twelve apostles, imbued with Jewish prejudices, had not understood Jesus; so their Gospels (Matthew, Mark, John) must be set aside. Paul alone had understood the Master, and the Gospel of Luke, his companion, must alone be an authority.—Volkmar has made the author of the fourth Gospel a partisan of Marcion, who sought to introduce his doctrines into the Church. But what is there in common between the violent hatred of Marcion against the Jewish law and the God of the Jews, and a Gospel in which the Logos, in coming to Israel, comes *to His own*, and, in entering into the temple of Jerusalem, declares that He is in the house of *His Father?* And how can it be reasonably maintained that a writer whose thought strikes all its roots into the soil of the Old Testament, is the disciple of a master who rejected from the New everything that implied the divinity of the Old? In saying this, we have answered the question of the same author, who asks why, if John existed before Marcion, the latter did not choose to make his Gospel rather than Luke the Gospel of his sect. The ancient heretic was more clear-sighted than the modern critic; he understood that, in order to use John, he must

mutilate it, in some sort, from one end to the other, and he preferred to reject it at one stroke *rescindendo*, as Tertullian says.

At the same period in which Justin, Valentinus and Marcion met each other in Rome, a fanatical sect arose in Asia Minor, Montanism. Its leader wished to make a reaction against the laxness of Christendom and the mechanical course of the official clergy. Montanus announced the near coming of the Christ, and pretended to cause the descent upon the Church of the Spirit who was promised for the last days, and whom he called the *Paraclete*, evidently in accordance with the promise of Jesus in John xiv. 16, 26, etc. He even identified himself with this Spirit, if it is true, as Theodoret affirms, that he gave himself the titles of *Paraclete, Logos, Bridegroom.* But it is not only these expressions, borrowed from John, it is the whole spiritualistic movement, it is that energetic reaction against the more and more prevailing ritualism, which implies the existence in the Church of a writing which was an authority, and was capable of serving as a point of support for so energetic a movement.

Thus, then, in 140, Justin, the martyr belonging to the orthodox Church, Valentinus, the Egyptian Gnostic, Marcion, who came from Pontus, Montanus, in Phrygia, are acquainted with and, excepting Marcion, use with one consent, the Gospel of John, in order to found upon it their doctrine and their churches; would all this be possible, if that work had only been in existence for a decade of years? The date 130–140 falls before these facts, just as the date 160–170 vanished in presence of those which were previously alleged.

Let us come to the third position attempted by criticism in our days.

110–125.

(Reuss, Nicolas, Renan, Sabatier, Weizsäcker, Hase.)

History offers us here four points for our guidance: The Gnostic Basilides, and the three apostolic Fathers, Papias, Polycarp, and Ignatius. Finally, we shall interrogate the appendix of our Gospel, chap. xxi., which, while connected with the work, does not properly form a part of it.

Basilides flourished at Alexandria about 120–125; he died a little after 132. Before teaching in Egypt, he is said to have labored in Persia and Syria. In the work *Archelai et Manetis disputatio*, it is said: "A certain Basilides, more anciently still, was a preacher among the Persians *a little after the time of the apostles.*" According to Epiphanius (*Haer.* xxiii. 1–7; xxiv. 1), he had also labored at Antioch. His activity, consequently, goes back as far as the earliest period of the second century. He himself claimed that he taught only what had been taught him by the Apostle Matthias according to the secret instructions which he had received from the Lord. That this assertion should have any shadow of probability, it is certainly necessary that he should have been *able* to meet with that apostle somewhere; a fact which carries us back for the period of his birth to a quite early time in the first century.[1]

[1] See Hofstede de Groot, *Basilides und seine Zeit.*

In a homily on Luke, attributed to Origen, it is said that "Basilides had the boldness already to write a gospel according to Basilides."[1] The word *already* proves that Basilides was regarded as belonging to the earliest times of Gnosticism. As to the expression: *a gospel according to Basilides*, it is very doubtful whether it is necessary to understand thereby an evangelical narrative designed to come into competition with our Gospels. By this term, indeed, Basilides himself understood, not a simple narration, but "the knowledge of supersensible things" (*ἡ τῶν ὑπερκοσμίων γνῶσις*) (*Philos.* of Hippolytus, vii. 27). We are told, also, that his narrative of the birth of Jesus accorded entirely with that of our Gospels (*Philos.*, ibid.), and history does not present the least trace of an apocryphal Basilidian gospel. But we know from Eusebius (*H. E.* iv. 7. 7), that this Gnostic wrote *twenty-four books on the Gospel* (*εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον*), which were refuted in a striking way by a Christian writer, named Agrippa Castor, whose work was still in the hands of Eusebius.[2] The real nature of this work of Basilides appears from a quotation which Clement of Alexandria makes from it in the *Stromata* (Bk. iv.), where he expresses himself thus: "Basilides says in the twenty-third book of his *exegetical dissertations*. . . ."[3] It was, therefore, a work of explanations; but on what text? The answer appears first, from the expression of Eusebius: "twenty-four books *on* (*εἰς*) *the Gospel*," and second, from the passage from the *Philosophumena* (vii. 22), according to which Basilides is said to have expressed himself as follows: "Here is what is said in the Gospels (*τὸ λεγόμενον ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις*)." From all this we conclude that this Gnostic set forth his theory respecting the origin of things in the form of exegetical explanations, having reference to the text of the Gospels which were received at his time in the churches. But the question for us to determine is whether he also worked upon the fourth Gospel. Now, we have two passages which seem to leave no doubt on this point; one is that we have just mentioned (*Philos.* vii. 22): "Here, says he [Basilides], is what is said in the Gospels: It was the true light which lighteneth every man coming into the world;" the other, a little further on, ch. 27: "Let everything have its own appropriate time, says he [Basilides], is what the Saviour sufficiently declares when he says: My hour is not yet come."—These two quotations are evidently connected with John i. 8 and ii. 4.

The criticism which is opposed to the authenticity of our Gospel is obliged to make all efforts to escape the consequences of these Johannean quotations in Basilides; for they amount to nothing less than the carrying back of the composition of the fourth Gospel even into the first century. In fact, men only quote in this way a book which has already a recognized authority. It has been claimed, therefore, that, in mentioning these quotations from Basilides, Hippolytus did not distinguish the writings of the master from those of his later disciples. The term *he says*, it is claimed, related simply in his thought to the adversary, whoever he

[1] Ambrose and Jerome have repeated this statement.

[2] "There has come down even to us a work by Agrippa Castor," etc.

[3] Ἐν τῷ εἰκοστῷ τρίτῳ τῶν ἐξηγητικῶν.

was, Basilides or the Basilidians, Valentinus or the Valentinians; and in favor of this supposition, the alleged fact has been adduced, that Hippolytus sets forth the Basilidian system in a later form than that in which Irenæus still knew it. According to the latter, indeed, the system was dualistic; this was the earliest form; according to Hippolytus, on the contrary, it is rather pantheistic; there is here, therefore, a more recent form. Discussion can be carried on at great length respecting this difference. For ourselves, we are disposed to accept the explanation given by Charteris (*Canonicity*, p. lxiii.), according to which Irenæus did not, in his exposition of the system, go back to its first foundations. There was a hidden pantheism at the source of its apparent dualism, and Hippolytus who had examined even the writings of the master has, more completely than Irenæus, apprehended and set forth the original principles. However it may be with this explanation, it does not seem to us possible that a serious writer quotes a whole series of texts which he attributes to an earlier writer, repeating over and over again the formula *he says*, and even several times indicating the author by his name, without having his work under his eyes. Renan says, quite simply and frankly (*L'Eglise chrêtienne*, p. 158): "The author of the Philosophumena undoubtedly made this analysis with reference to the original works of Basilides." And Weizsäcker, a few years ago, expressed himself also in the same way (*Unters.* p. 233): "It cannot be doubted that we have here quotations from a work of Basilides, in which the Johannean Gospel was used." At the present time, he has changed his opinion.[1] For what reason? Because these quotations ascribed to Basilides relate to Biblical writings whose composition is later than the time of Basilides himself. And what are these writings? They can only be the Epistles to the Colossians and the Ephesians, quoted many times by this Gnostic in the extracts from the Philosophumena, and perhaps the Gospel of John itself. Is it needful to call the attention of this scholar to the fact that he falls here into a vicious circle? For he rests his views precisely upon the point which is in question. If Weizsäcker reasons thus: The Basilides of Hippolytus quotes the letters to the Ephesians and the Colossians; therefore there is here a false Basilides, since those letters did not yet exist at the time of the true Basilides; have not we the right—we who believe in the authenticity of those epistles—to reason in an opposite way, and to say: Basilides quotes those writings: therefore in his time they existed and were acknowledged in the Church. This conclusion, valid for Colossians and Ephesians, is also valid for the Gospel of John.

Keim has also made a discovery which is said to prove that our Gospel is posterior to Basilides. This Gnostic writer asserted that the Jews by mistake had crucified Simon of Cyrene instead of Jesus, and that Jesus was all the time laughing at them. Here, says the author of the *Life of Jesus*, is that which explains the omission of the story of Simon bearing the cross in the fourth Gospel. Pseudo-John had noticed the abuse which

[1] *Jahrb. für deutsche Theol.*, 1868, p. 525.

Basilides made of this incident, and for this reason he suppressed it. We need not long discuss such an argument. We have treated in detail John's omissions and have shown that they are to be explained simply by the uselessness of such repetitions. To what purpose relate again what two or three widely-spread writings had already sufficiently related? It would be curious, certainly, to see one of our critics taking upon himself the task of explaining, by allusions to the Gnostic systems, all the gaps in the fourth Gospel!

Papias was a contemporary of Basilides. We have already seen (p. 43) that by this expression: "What Aristion and John the Presbyter *say*," he indicates clearly that these two men, immediate disciples of Jesus, were still living at the moment when he wrote. The years 110–120, are, therefore, the latest period to which we can assign the composition of his work. Already at that time, there was rising a whole literature which labored to falsify the meaning of the Gospel narratives. Papias also declares that "he does not take pleasure in the books in which many things are related, and in which the attempt is made to impose on the Church precepts that are strange and different from those which were given by the Truth itself."[1] It seems to me probable that in expressing himself thus he alludes to the first appearance of the Gnostic writings, such as those of Cerinthus, of the Ophites and the Sethians, of Saturninus, perhaps of Basilides himself.

It is quite generally affirmed in our days that all trace of the fourth Gospel is wanting in Papias, and this fact is regarded as the most decisive proof of the later composition of the Gospel of John. We pray the impartial reader carefully to consider the following facts:

Of Papias' work entitled *Explanations of the Words of the Lord* (in five books), there remain to us only some thirty lines, which Eusebius has preserved for us; they undoubtedly belonged to the preface. Papias explains therein the preference which he had thought himself obliged to give, for the end which he proposed to himself, to the text of Matthew over that of Mark; this, at least, is the meaning which we attribute to his words. He gives an account of the sources from which he had drawn the anecdotes respecting the life of Jesus, which were not contained in our Gospels, and by means of which he tried to explain His sayings. These sources, as we have seen, were of two sorts: they were first the accounts which the elders (the immediate disciples of the Lord) had formerly given to him himself; they were, next, the reports which he had gathered from the mouth of visitors who had also had the advantage of conversing with apostles and disciples of Jesus. He asked them "What Andrew had said to them, or Peter, or Philip, or Thomas, or James, or John, or Matthew, or any other of the Lord's disciples, and what Aristion and the Presbyter John, disciples of the Lord, say." This enumeration offers food for thought. Why is *Andrew* named at the beginning and before Peter himself? This order is contrary to the constant and in some sort stereotyped usage of the Synoptics; see all the apostolic catalogues (Matt. x.; Mark

[1] See the entire passage, pp. 43–45.

iii.; Luke vi.). The first chapter of John alone gives the answer to this question: Andrew (with John himself, who remains unnamed), was the first who came into the presence of the Saviour; he figures as the first personage in the evangelic history. After Andrew, Papias says: *Peter*. According to John i., Andrew, his brother, brought him, indeed, on the same day to Jesus. Then Papias says: *Philip;* he is precisely the one who immediately follows Andrew and Peter in the Johannean narrative (i. 43 ff.). Moreover, Andrew and Philip are the two apostles who are afterwards most frequently named in our Gospel (vi. 5–9; xii. 20–22). Then comes *Thomas*. Nathanael is here omitted (John i. 46 ff.), we know not why; he is included in the sort of *et cetera* with which the incomplete list closes: "or any other of the Lord's disciples." As for Thomas, he is the one among all the rest of the disciples who, together with the preceding ones, plays the most striking part in the fourth Gospel (xi. 16; xiv. 5; xx. 24 ff.). Afterwards, come *James* and *John*. Why so late, these who are always named in the Synoptics immediately after and with Peter? It is in the fourth Gospel also, that we must seek the explanation of this phenomenon. The two sons of Zebedee are not once named in the whole course of the narrative; they are not expressly designated, except in the appendix, xxi., where their names are found, as here, at the end of the list of the apostles who are mentioned in that passage. Among all the other apostles, *Matthew* only is further named by Papias; and it has been supposed, rightly no doubt, that it is the mention of the fourth evangelist which here leads to the mention of the first. It may be presumed also that these three names: James, John and Matthew, occupy this secondary position because the question in this passage was of the apostles as having furnished to Papias the oral traditions which he used. Now James had died too early to be able to give much information, and John and Matthew had consigned the greater part of theirs to their writings. Finally, Papias names two personages who were still living, *Aristion* and the *Presbyter John*, whom he calls "disciples of the Lord." It is exactly in the same way that the Johannean enumeration xxi. 2, closes: "And two others of his disciples" [not apostles]. If we add to these similarities, which are so striking, the fact that all these disciples named by Papias (except Peter, James and John), play no part whatever in the Synoptical narrative, we shall be led to acknowledge that the idea which this Father possessed of the evangelical history was formed on the foundation of the narrative of the fourth Gospel, even more than on that of the three others. Lüdemann, in his articles on the fragment of Papias,[1] does not call in question the similarity which we have just established. "It is a fact," he says, "that the fragment of Papias is closely related to the Johannean manner of speaking, both in the expressions ἐντολαί, *commandments*, and ἀλήθεια, *truth* (see the fragment, pp. 43–45), and in the beginning of the list of the apostolic names . . . The unexpected coming in of Thomas, in Papias, likewise does not allow us to think of anything but the fourth Gospel."

[1] *Jahrb. für protest. Theol.*, 1879, 3d *Heft*.

But after this frank declaration come the expedients which are never wanting. "There existed in the circle from which the Johannean writings came forth in Asia a mode of speaking and thinking, which, on the one hand, has left certain elements in the writings of Papias (between 120–140), and which, on the other, has found its full blossoming in the writings of pseudo-John, composed at nearly the same time." This explanation would be strictly admissible, if the question were of some fact of the evangelical history related simultaneously by the two authors, or of the use of some common terms such as *commandment* and *truth*. But it cannot account for an enumeration of proper names, such as those mentioned in the passage of Papias and in which the whole evangelical history is reflected. Holtzmann has perceived the injury to his cause which was involved in the admissions of his colleague; he has attempted to ward off the blow in another way.[1] He explains the order of the apostles in the fragment of Papias by the geographical situation of the countries in which they are thought to have labored as missionaries. This solution will remain the exclusive property of its author.

Two facts seem to us further to attest the existence of the fourth Gospel before the time of Papias. Eusebius attests that this Father quoted as evidence, in his work, passages from the first Epistle of John, as well as from the first Epistle of Peter. Now we have proved that that letter of John is by the *same* author as the fourth Gospel, and that it was composed *after* the latter. If, then, Papias was acquainted with and used the Epistle, how should he not have been acquainted with and have used the Gospel composed by the same author?—In the Vatican library there is found a Latin manuscript of the Gospels, of the ninth century, in which John's Gospel is preceded by a preface wherein it is said: "The Gospel of John was published and given to the churches by John while he was still living, as Papias of Hierapolis, the beloved disciple of John, relates in his five exoteric books, that is to say, the last ones." These last words evidently come from an incorrect copy, like so many of the sentences in the Muratorian fragment. Instead of exoteric, we must, at all events, read *exegetic*; comp. the title of Papias' book: "*Expositions* (ἐξηγήσεις) of the words of the Lord." Besides, this statement is followed by some legendary details,[2] which, however, are not ascribed to Papias himself. Notwithstanding all this, the fact that Papias spoke in his five books of the Gospel of John is yet attested by this passage.[3]

Irenæus sometimes quotes *the elders* who lived with John in Asia Minor until the time of Trajan. They were, thus, contemporaries of Papias and Polycarp. Here is an explanation which he ascribes to them (v. 36): "As the elders say: Those who shall be judged worthy of enjoying the heavenly abode will find their place there, while the rest will inhabit the city [the earthly Jerusalem]; and it is for this reason that the Lord said:[4]

[1] *Papias und Johannes*, in the *Zeitschrift für wissenchaftl. Theol.*, 1880, Heft 1.

[2] As the following for example: that it was Papias who wrote the Gospel at John's dictation.

[3] Comp. Tischendorf, *Wann wurden unsere Evangelien verfasst?* pp. 118, 119.

[4] Literally: "And for this reason the Lord *to have said* (εἰρηκέναι)." The infinitive serves to indicate that here is the saying of the elders themselves.

"In my Father's house there are many mansions." If it is the saying of Jesus related in John xiv. 2, which the elders interpreted in this way, as seems evident, then the Gospel of John was already in their hands. This appears, likewise, from the passage in Irenæus, ii. 22, where he attributes to them the idea that Jesus had attained the age of forty or fifty years—which can scarcely have arisen except through a misunderstanding of the words of the Jews, John viii. 57: "Thou art not yet fifty years old, and thou hast seen Abraham!"

Polycarp wrote, according to Irenæus, a very large number of letters, of which there remains to us but a single one consisting of only thirteen brief chapters. The fourth Gospel is not quoted in it; but we can prove, on the other hand, the truth of the statement of Eusebius, who declares that Polycarp, as well as Papias, borrowed testimonies from the first Epistle of Peter and the first Epistle of John; this is what induced him to place these works among the *homologoumena*. In fact, we read in Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians (chap. 7) these words: "Whosoever does not confess that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is an antichrist." This is the principle laid down by John, 1 Ep. iv. 3: "Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God; and this is the spirit of antichrist." The coincidence of these two sentences cannot be accidental. The expedient devised by Baur and Zeller, who would find herein only a maxim circulating at this period in the Church, and that of Volkmar, who claims that it is John who copies Polycarp, and not the reverse, are destitute of probability. Ten lines of John read by the side of ten lines of Polycarp show on which side are the originality and priority. We must, therefore, conclude that if this letter of Polycarp is authentic, as Zahn[1] has with so much learning demonstrated, and if it dates, as appears from its contents, from the time which closely followed the martyrdom of Ignatius (in 110), the first Epistle of John, and consequently the Gospel, already existed at that period.

But it is asked how it happens, in that case, that Papias and Polycarp did not make more abundant use of such a work. Especially is the silence of Eusebius respecting any citation whatever from our Gospel, on the part of these two Fathers, set in contrast with the very express mention which he makes of the use of the first epistle, by both of them.—If Eusebius has expressly noticed this last fact, it is because the two epistles of Peter and John form a part of the collection of the Catholic Epistles, which, with the exception of these two, were all of them disputed writings. He was desirous, therefore, of marking their exceptional character as *homologoumena* in this collection, a character appearing from the use which was made of them by two such men as Papias and Polycarp. It was quite otherwise with the Gospel, which indisputably belonged to the class of books universally received. The use which these two apostolic Fathers might have made of it entered into the general usage. Eusebius himself gives an explanation respecting his general method (*H. E.* iii. 3, 3): "He wishes," he says, "to point out what ecclesiastical writings

[1] In his *Ignatius von Antiochien*.

made use of disputed books, and what ones among these books they made use of; then, what things, [or some of the things which][1] have been said respecting the universally received writings of the New Testament, and everything which has been said (ὅσα) respecting those which are not so received." To mention certain interesting details respecting the Homologoumena (as we know that he has done with regard to Matthew and Mark), then to report everything which he could gather respecting the Antilegomena—this was the end which he proposed to himself. It was therefore precisely because he, together with the whole Church, ranked John in the first class, that he did not think himself obliged expressly to point out the use which these Fathers made of this gospel. But, on the other hand, if he had discovered, in the case of such men, a complete blank with respect to this work, he could not have affirmed, as he does, its universal adoption. Still more: a word in the discussion of Eusebius respecting the fragment of Papias which he has preserved for us, clearly shows that he had found in that Father numerous passages relating to the fourth Gospel. On occasion of the mention of the name of *John* in the enumeration of the apostles by Papias, he remarks that this Father means evidently to designate thereby "the evangelist" (σαφῶς δηλῶν τὸν εὐαγγελιστήν). He might have said: *the apostle*, but he enters into the thought of Papias himself, and says: *the evangelist*, which clearly proves that he found in his work the constant evidence of the fact that John was the author of a Gospel. As to Polycarp, nothing obliged him, in precisely those eight pages of his which remain to us, to quote the Gospel of John. What preacher quotes in every one of his sermons all the writings of the New Testament which he recognizes as authentic?

The interminable discussions are well known, to which the letters of Ignatius, the bishop of Antioch at the beginning of the second century, have given rise. A nearly unanimous tradition, supported by the testimony of authors who wrote at Antioch itself, such as Chrysostom and Evagrius, declares that he perished at Rome, being devoured by wild beasts in the circus, in consequence of a sentence of the Emperor Trajan.[2] It was while on his way as a condemned person to that capital (between 107 and 116), that he is said to have written the seven letters which alone can claim authenticity.[3] These letters exist in a double form, one longer, the other more simple and concise. Zahn, in his book on *Ignatius of Antioch*, has clearly proved that the first of these two texts is the result of a deliberate work of interpolation; he has even very probably pointed out the author of this fraud.[4] He has, at the same time,

[1] Both translations are possible, according as we accent the Greek pronoun τίνα (*what things*), or τινά (*some* of the things).

[2] The chronicler John Malalas (8th cent.) places the martyrdom of Ignatius at Antioch itself. In that case, Ignatius could never have made the journey to Rome to which these letters refer. But how then can we explain so general a tradition? Would the Church of Antioch itself have so easily resigned in favor of Rome the honor of having seen such a martyrdom accomplished in its own midst?

[3] Eight others exist which are undoubtedly forgeries.

[4] One of the least honorable representatives of the semi-Arian party, Acacius, the successor of Eusebius at Cesarea.

demonstrated the authenticity of the seven letters, as they have been preserved for us in the briefer form. The historian Eusebius, already was acquainted only with these seven, and in this text. It is true that there have been recently discovered three among these seven, in Syriac, in a still briefer form;[1] and, at the first moment, the learned world was inclined to regard this text as the only faithful reproduction of the work of Ignatius. Zahn seems to us to have victoriously combated this opinion, and to have proved that this text is only an extract, made by some Syrian monk, from a more ancient translation in that language. There remains but one alternative; the authenticity of the seven letters, as Eusebius knew them, or their entire unauthenticity.—Two reasons especially are alleged in favor of this last opinion: 1. The Episcopal constitution, as it appears in these letters, belongs, it is said, to an epoch much later in the second century than the time of Ignatius; 2. The Gnosticism which is combated in them, betrays likewise a time posterior to Ignatius' death. These reasons do not seem to us decisive. The Episcopate, as its character is implied in these letters, is still a purely *parochial* ministry, as in the apostolic times, it is not the later *provincial* Episcopate. That which alone distinguishes it from the ministry of this name in the time of the apostles, is that it appears to be concentrated in a single person. But this is already the case in the Apocalypse, where *the angel* of the Church designates precisely the man who concentrates in himself the presbyterial power; and indeed long before this we meet already men like James, the Lord's brother, at Jerusalem, then his cousin and successor, Simeon, Anianus at Alexandria, Evagrius at Antioch, Linus at Rome, who occupy a position exactly similar to that which Ignatius ascribes to the bishop of his time. As to the heresy implied in these letters, it already had all its antecedent conditions in the first century; we can see this in the second Epistle to the Corinthians (xi. 3, 4), in the Epistle to the Colossians, and in the Apocalypse, where a form of Gnosticism is already clearly indicated (ii. 20, 24). The germs of heresy were sown abundantly in the East at the time of Ignatius. What in our view renders the hypothesis of the unauthenticity of these letters inadmissible, is that it seems impossible to invent, not only a style so original and a thought so strange, but especially such a character. There is a man in these letters, and a man who is not manufactured.

The following are some quotations from our Gospel which are contained in the seven letters, the text of which can lay claim to authenticity. *Rom.* (c. 7): "The living water which speaks in me says to me inwardly: Come to the Father; I take no pleasure either in corruptible food or in the joys of this life; I desire the bread of God which is the flesh of Jesus Christ . . . I desire as drink His blood which is incorruptible love." The entire Gospel of John is, as it were, included in this cry of the martyr; but comp. more specially the words iv. 14; xiv. 6; vi. 27, 32, 51, 55, 56. *Philad.* (c. 7): "The Spirit does not deceive, he who comes from God; for

[1] They were published for the first time by Cureton (1845).

he knows whence he comes and whither he goes, and he condemns secret things" (John iii. 8, 20). In the same epistle (c. 9): "He who is the door of the Father (*θύρα τοῦ πατρός*) by which Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and the prophets and the apostles and the Church enter" (John x. 7–9). In the letter to the Ephesians (c. 7), Jesus is called (*ἐν σαρκὶ γενόμενος θεός*) *God come in the flesh:* and in that to the *Magnesians* (c. 8) the expression is used (*αὐτοῦ λόγος ἀΐδιος*), *His eternal word.* The idea of spiritual *communion* (*ἕνωσις*), which forms the substance of these letters, as of that of Polycarp, rests on John xvii., as Riggenbach has remarked.

Hilgenfeld, who places the composition of these letters in 166, finds no difficulty in acknowledging that our Gospel (published according to him in 130) is really used in the passages quoted in the letters to the Romans and Philadelphians; he even affirms that "the entire theology of Ignatius' letters rests upon the Gospel of John." We welcome this declaration and conclude that, however little authentic matter there may be in the letters of this martyr, the existence and use of the Gospel of John are attested from the beginning of the second century.[1]

It remains for us to interrogate a final witness—the appendix placed at the end of the fourth Gospel, as the twenty-first chapter, in particular the twenty-fourth verse, the authenticity of which cannot be contested.[2] At the end of this account of one of the last appearances of Jesus after He rose from the dead, the exact text of a saying is restored which Jesus addressed to Peter with regard to John, and which circulated in the Church in an incorrect form. Jesus was made to say that John was not going to die. The author of the appendix, who is either John himself or one of those who surrounded him, and who had heard him relate this scene (see p. 64 f.), recalls the fact that Jesus had not expressed Himself thus, but that He had simply said: "If I will that He tarry till I come, what is it to thee?" At what time can we suppose that this correction was judged necessary? At the end of the second century, where Keim places the composition of this passage? But at that time, either the saying of Jesus was forgotten, or, if it was still repeated, it was somewhat late to remove the offence which it might cause. No, surely; there was but one period when this correction would have been in place. It was when men saw the aged apostle growing feeble, and asked themselves: Is he, then, going to die, in spite of the Lord's promise? Or when he had just died, and the offence was really occasioned. This passage, therefore, carries its date in itself; it comes either from the days which preceded, or from those which immediately followed John's death. The contrast between the *present* participle: "This is the disciple *who testifies* (*ὁ μαρτυρῶν*) of these things," and the *past* participle: "and who *wrote* them (*καὶ γράψας*)," appears to me to decide in favor of the former alternative. The disciple whom Jesus loved was still living and testifying when this passage was written. However

[1] We do not mention here either the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, because of their numerous interpolations, nor the *Shepherd of Hermas* and the *Epistle of Barnabas*, in which the borrowings from our Gospel do not seem to us by any means evident.

[2] It is known that it is not the same with ver. 25, which is wanting in the *Sinaitic* MS.

this may be, this twenty-first chapter is necessarily later than the Gospel; hence it follows that this work dates even from the life of John.

We think we have thus proved that the third position attempted by criticism—that from 110–125—is as irreconcilable with the facts as the two others, and that we are forced to take a new step backward, and to place the composition of this work in the latest times of the first century. But we do not think that we can go back to an earlier date. Some writers—for example, Wittichen, Lange—have attempted to do this. The former dates our Gospel from 70–80 (see p. 25); the latter places it before the destruction of Jerusalem. A period so far back is incompatible with the knowledge of our three Synoptical Gospels, which the author not only himself possesses, but which he supposes, from beginning to end, to be in the possession of his readers. The dissemination of those three works, published either a little before or a little after the destruction of Jerusalem, requires a considerably long interval of time between their composition and that of our Gospel. The date of this latter, therefore, must probably —in accordance with the facts which we have just set forth—be placed between 80 and 90.

CHAPTER SECOND.

THE AUTHOR.

MANGOLD formulates his judgment respecting the external testimonies relative to the fourth Gospel in these terms: "The external attestation is scarcely less strong than that for the Synoptical Gospels;" then he adds: "It would be sufficient to authenticate it, if the internal reasons did not oppose to the admission of its authenticity objections which, for me at least, remain up to this time insurmountable."[1] It is this second class of considerations which is now especially to occupy us. We approach the central and decisive question—the one for whose solution everything that precedes has only served to prepare the way. It has been sometimes claimed that our Gospel remains what it is, whoever may be its author. Those who maintain this proposition do not themselves seriously believe what they affirm; otherwise they would not be so zealous in contending against the Johannean origin of this work. And when Keim expresses himself thus: "The beauty of this book, its edifying quality, its saintliness . . . all this does not depend on a name," he will permit us to reply to him: You deceive others, or you deceive yourself; for you cannot conceal from yourself the fact that the discourses put into the mouth of Jesus, and the conception of His person which is set forth in this book, have for the Church an altogether different value, according as it is the beloved apostle of the Lord who gives us an account of what he has seen and heard, or a thinker of the second century who composes all this after his own fancy.

We have here four subjects to investigate: 1. The *ecclesiastical testimonies*

[1] Bleek-Mangold's *Einl.*, p. 281.

bearing more particularly on the person of the author; 2. The *objections* raised by modern criticism against the result of this tradition; 3. The *internal proof*, derived from the study of the book itself; 4. The examination of the principal *hypotheses* which are in our days set in opposition to the traditional opinion of the Johannean origin.

§ 1. THE TRADITIONAL TESTIMONIES.

Our point of departure is the period at which the general conviction of the Church expresses itself by a collection of indisputable testimonies, in the last third of the second century.

We find here Clement of Alexandria, who relates to us the origin of the fourth Gospel in the following manner: "*John*, the last, perceiving that the bodily things (*τὰ σωματικά*, the external facts) had been related in the Gospels, . . . composed a spiritual Gospel" (Eus. *H. E.*, vi. 14).

Polycrates of Ephesus, at the same time, expresses himself thus: "Illustrious men are buried in Asia, Philip . . . at Hierapolis; and, moreover, *John*, who rested on the bosom of the Lord, and who is buried at Ephesus" (Eus. *H. E.*, v. 31). This testimony proves that at Ephesus John was regarded as the author of the Gospel, since no one doubted that he was the beloved disciple who is spoken of in John xiii. 25.

Irenæus thus closes his report respecting the composition of the Gospels: "After that, *John*, the disciple of the Lord who rested on His bosom, also published the Gospel while he dwelt at Ephesus, in Asia" (*Adv. Haer.* iii. 1).

We have already quoted the testimony of Theophilus: "All the inspired men, among whom *John* says, In the beginning was the Word." The following is the way in which the Muratorian fragment relates the origin of our Gospel: "The author of the fourth among the Gospels is *John*, one of the disciples.[1] As his fellow-disciples and the bishops exhorted him [to write], he said to them: Fast with me these three days, and we will mutually relate to each other what shall have been revealed to each one. In that same night it was revealed to Andrew, one of the apostles, that John should relate everything in his own name, all the others revising [his narrative] . . . What is there, then, surprising in this, that John, in his epistles, sets forth these things in detail, saying in reference to himself: That which we have seen with our eyes, that which we have heard with our ears, and that which our hands have handled, we write unto you. Thus he declares himself successively eye and ear-witness, and, moreover, a redactor of the wonderful things of God." Hilgenfeld claims that we find in this report an allusion to doubts which existed at that time respecting the Johannean origin of our Gospel. Hesse, in his excellent work on the Muratorian fragment, has shown that this pas-

[1] This term is not opposed to the term *apostle*, as Reuss thinks. It is the translation of the term *μαθητὴς τοῦ κυρίου* which is applied by Papias to all the apostles, and many times by Irenæus to John himself (iii. 1, 3, 4).

sage betrays no such intention. The expression "what is there surprising?" applies not to the Gospel, but to the epistle.

Starting from this point, let us try to ascend the stream of tradition even to the apostolic times, and to search out the earliest indications of that conviction which shows itself so universally at the end of the second century. Between 140 and 150, it expresses itself, as it seems to us, in an unquestionable manner.

We have seen that Justin, according to the nearly universal admission at the present day, places our Gospel in the number of the Memoirs respecting the life of Jesus, of which he habitually made use. He calls these writings Memoirs *of the apostles*, and declares that some were composed by apostles and others by apostolic helpers. Consequently, if the fourth Gospel formed a part of them, Justin could ascribe it only to an apostle, and this apostle could only be John, since no one has ever attempted to ascribe this book to any other apostolic personage than John. And as, according to Justin, the Memoirs of the apostles already formed a collection, which was joined with that of the prophets and read, side by side with the latter, in the public worship of the Christians, it must have been at that period that the four identically-framed titles were placed at the beginning of the Gospels: "according to Matthew . . . according to John." This designation by titles—a work of the Church—accompanied the uniting of them in a canonical collection. The title, *according to John*, is, therefore, the expression of the general sentiment of the churches touching this book in the middle of the second century.

And it was not only the orthodox churches which, already at that period, had this thought; it was also the sects which were separated from the great body of the Church; witness, on one side, Marcion, who rejected our Gospel, not because it was not by an apostle of Jesus, but, on the contrary, inasmuch as it was composed by one of them, that is to say by John (see p. 156); witness also the most illustrious disciple of Valentinus, Ptolemy, who, in his letter to Flora, quoted our Gospel, saying: "The *apostle* declares" (p. 144). According to Irenæus, Ptolemy even went so far as to affirm, because of the prologue of the Gospel, that the true author of the Valentinian Ogdoad was *John* (p. 144).

Going still further back to a period from which only rare monuments remain to us, we discover always the same conviction.

We have already seen that, in the view of Papias, John was not only an apostle, but *an evangelist*, and that it is this quality of author of a Gospel which most naturally explains the position which he assigns to him in his famous list of apostles by the side of Matthew (see pp. 43, 160 f.).

If we do not possess any special testimony of Polycarp, there is a fact of much more considerable importance than any declaration whatever could have. Polycarp lived up to the middle of the second century; it was, then, during his activity as bishop of Smyrna, that our Gospel began to be circulated, and that it was spread throughout the whole Church as John's work. If he had not believed in the Johannean origin of this work, he would not have failed to deny it; for the use which the Gnostics made

of this book rendered it very compromising for the Church, of which Polycarp was the most venerated leader; and the least denial on the part of such a man would have profoundly shaken the opinion of the Church. But nothing of the kind occurred. History does not indicate the least trace of hesitation, either in the case of Polycarp himself or among the members of the Church. No one of the presbyters of whom Irenæus speaks, and who "lived with John in Asia up to the time of Trajan," expressed a doubt—so that our Gospel was received without dispute, from one end of the world to the other, as the work of John. This absence of protestation is a negative fact of a very positive importance. We must not confound it with a mere literary silence which can be explained by accidental circumstances.

But from this period and from the circle even in which John lived, a positive testimony makes itself heard: "This disciple [the one whom Jesus loved] is he who testifieth of these things and who wrote these things; and we know that his testimony is true." This is what we read in John xxi. 24. Who are those who speak to us in this way, and who thus attest the composition of the fourth Gospel by the disciple whom Jesus loved? They are personally acquainted with him, since, in virtue of the knowledge which they have of him, they believe themselves able to guarantee the truth of his testimony. They do this during his life, since they say of him: "who *testifieth* and *wrote*" (p. 166). They live about him, therefore, and it is in their hands, undoubtedly, that he deposited his book; and, before giving it to the public, they supply this postscript, clearly perceiving that, by reason of the differences which exist between this work and its predecessors, it will have some difficulty in opening a way for itself. How can the force of such testimony be escaped? Reuss supposes that those who gave it were *bona fide* deceived, and that, living already quite a long time after John's death, they confounded with him the anonymous writer who had, by means of his narratives, composed the Gospel. But we have already seen that this twenty-first chapter can only have been written at a period very near to the death of John, when such an error was not possible. The use of the present: "he who *testifieth*," confirms this remark. There would be only one possible supposition, namely: that the pseudo-John, in the course of the second century, had himself furnished this attestation. After having assumed the mask of St. John, he attempted to sustain his first fraud by adding to it a second. He imagined a circle of friends of the apostle, and himself composed, under their name, the postscript which we have just read. The composers of apocryphal works have often been excused by speaking of pious fraud. But here we should evidently have something more; we should even come to the borders of knavery. And he who imagined a course like this, is the man to whom we must attribute the qualities of moral purity, profound holiness, intimate communion with God, which were necessary for the composition of such a Gospel! The psychological and moral sense protests.

In the whole course of the second century, there exists, so far as our knowledge extends, but one single denial of the Johannean origin of the

fourth Gospel. A party, to which Epiphanius gave the name *Alogi* (ἄλογοι, those who deny the Logos), maintained that the author of this work was, not the Apostle John, but the heretic Cerinthus, his adversary at Ephesus. This rejection was not founded on any traditional testimony. "The grounds on which those persons rested," says Zeller himself, "were, so far as we are acquainted with them, derived from internal criticism . . ." What follows from this fact—the only one which the adversaries of the authenticity can allege? Two things: first, that the Alogi lacked all support from tradition; secondly, that there did not exist a shadow of doubt respecting the fact that our Gospel was composed at Ephesus in the time of St. John, since Cerinthus, to whom they ascribed it, was the contemporary and rival of this apostle. The sole opponents are, thus, transformed into witnesses and defenders.

§ 2. THE OBJECTIONS.

It is in opposition to this result of a tradition which may be called unanimous, that many scholars rise up at the present day, and we have now to examine their reasons.

Hase, in his *History of Jesus*, enumerates eight objections against the authenticity; after having successively set them aside, he makes for himself a ninth which he does not succeed in solving, and which determines his negative vote. We shall follow him in this very clear exposition. Only of these nine objections we shall detach some which he unites with the others, and which it seems to us preferable to treat separately. The first seven, as we shall see, have already found their solution implicitly in the preceding pages.

I. The *silence* of the most ancient Fathers, particularly those of Asia Minor, respecting the fourth Gospel. It seems to us that the two preceding chapters have solved this objection. Hase justly observes that "nothing is more uncertain than this assertion: a writer must have spoken of a certain thing or a certain person." The Synoptical Gospels had been for a long time spread abroad; they had already for a generation formed the substance of the knowledge which the Church possessed of the history of Jesus. The Gospel of John, which was quite recent, had not yet made its way nor exerted its own influence; time must be allowed for it to take its place, before an appeal could be made to its narratives in the same way as to those of the earlier Gospels. We find this to be the fact only after the time of Justin.

II. John, being *Judaizing* as he was, cannot be the author of a Gospel as spiritual as that which bears his name. This, as it seems, is the strongest objection in the view of Schürer: "It is psychologically inconceivable that an apostle who, in his mature age, still disputed with Paul respecting the permanent value of the law, should have afterwards written a Gospel whose anti-Judaism surpasses even that of Paul."[1]—We think we have shown

[1] *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1876, iv., p. 774.

that this estimate of John's standpoint according to Gal. ii. is ill founded. The apostles personally observed the law, but not with the idea of its permanent value for salvation; otherwise they must have imposed it on the Gentiles; and instead of giving the hand of fellowship to Paul and Barnabas, they would have finally broken with them. The difference being a matter of *practice*, not of principle, the fall of Jerusalem must have resulted in the settlement of it, by breaking up the last remnant of solidarity between the apostles and their own people. Hase rightly remarks, that the residence of John in Asia Minor, his activity in the field which had been sowed by Paul, and the immense influence which he notoriously exercised in that country of Greek culture prove with what breadth, flexibility and freedom of mind he adapted himself to this new region, and knew how to become a Greek with the Greeks.

III. The Christianity of the churches of Asia Minor had a *legal* character. Now, if John was the author of such a teaching, he cannot have been the writer who composed our Gospel. But on what does this affirmation of the Judaizing character of the churches of Asia Minor rest? On their gross Chiliasm, it is answered. We have already seen that almost the whole Church of the second and of the greater part of the third century was devoted to Millenarianism; nevertheless it was not Judaistic. Moreover, the Paschal rite of these churches is alleged, in which their Judaistic sympathies are betrayed. The churches of Asia celebrated the Holy Supper of the Paschal feast on the 14th of Nisan in the evening, independently of the day of the week on which this monthly date fell, while the other churches, Rome in particular, celebrated the Holy Paschal Supper on the Sunday morning which followed Good Friday, whatever might be the day of the month on which that Sunday occurred. What were the reasons which had determined the rite which the churches of Asia had adopted? Either they wished thus to celebrate the evening of the day in the afternoon of which, according to the fourth Gospel, Christ died (the 14th of Nisan, the day before the Passover); in that case, whatever Baur may say, the Asiatic rite rests on the narrative of the Passion according to the fourth Gospel, and bears witness thereby to the authenticity of this work; this rite is, therefore, entirely independent of Jewish legality. Or the churches of Asia celebrated the Supper on the evening of the 14th, because it was on that evening that the Jews celebrated the Paschal feast,—and this is the explanation which certain expressions of the Fathers render most probable. Would this be a symptom of Jewish legality? But St. Paul himself saw in the Paschal lamb the symbol of Christ (1 Cor. v. 7); he very carefully regarded the Jewish feasts, particularly that of the Passover, as is proved by Acts xx. 6: "After the days of unleavened bread, we set sail from Philippi," and 1 Cor. v. 8, where, exactly at the time of the Passover feast (comp. xvi. 8), he represents the Christian life as a permanent feast of unleavened bread. It is probable, therefore, that it was Paul, and not John, who had originally introduced at Ephesus this Paschal rite which John merely continued. We find here the same symbolism in virtue of which Jesus, in the institu-

tion of the Holy Supper, had transformed the memorial of the deliverance from Egypt into a memorial of eternal redemption.

IV. The *divergences from the Synoptics*.—We have already treated this subject, and shown in detail that they are all to the advantage of the fourth Gospel, and evidently prove its historical superiority, so that, far from forming a point in the argument against the authenticity of this work, they are one of the most decisive proofs in favor of it.

V. The elevated, and, for the multitude, often even *incomprehensible*, contents of the discourses of Jesus. This subject has been treated at length; it is unnecessary to return to it.

VI. How could a Galilean fisherman have attained *such profound wisdom* as that which shines forth in many parts of our Gospel? But, we will ask in our turn, how can we estimate what an intimate and prolonged contact with the Lord may have produced in an ardent and profound soul, such as John's must have been? "If," says Hase, admirably, "the highest human wisdom has come from Christianity, must it not be allowed that, in proximity to a being like Jesus, a young man with a rich and profound soul may have been developed and, as it were, set on fire? A mind so powerful as that which, in any case, Jesus had, does not merely attach itself to a faithful and loyal heart, but also to a mind which has lofty aims and aspirations. Most certainly, if John, when he taught in Asia, had only possessed the apostolic simplicity and culture of the Galilean fisherman, he would not have produced in that country the enduring impression of admiration and veneration which he left there."

VII. The author of the fourth Gospel came forth from the *Gnostic* circles of the second century, not from the apostolic college. We have weighed this proposition, and it has been found to be too weak. There was certainly an elementary Gnosticism which dated from the apostolic times, and with which already the epistles of Paul and the letters in the Apocalypse contended; it is against this that the first epistle of John is directed. It has nothing in common with the great Gnostic systems of the second century, except the general tendency; and the fourth evangelist, far from having been formed under the influence of these latter systems, furnished in his book a part of the materials by means of which the leaders of those schools constructed their edifices on the very ground of Christianity.

VIII. We come to the decisive point, *the doctrine of the Logos*. The Judæo-Alexandrian origin of this idea and this term is historically proved; this alone is enough to prove that an apostle of Jesus cannot have written a book which rests altogether upon it. It must, therefore, be admitted that, as Philo, the principal representative of Alexandrianism at that period, made use of the ideas of Greek philosophy to give a rational account of the religious contents of his Jewish beliefs, in the same way the author of the fourth Gospel, in his turn, made use of Philo in order to appropriate to himself speculatively the contents of his Christian beliefs.[1]

[1] See *La doctrine du Logos dans le quatrième évangile*, etc., by Jean Réville, pp. 179, 180.

Two facts give an apparent support to this explanation of the Johannean teaching: 1. The *term* Logos inscribed at the beginning of our Gospel, which is precisely the one by which Philo expresses the fundamental notion of his philosophy; 2. The *idea* itself of an intermediate being between God and the world, by means of whom the absolute being communicates with finite beings. But it is to this point that the whole analogy is limited. And it remains to inquire whether what the two writers have in common in this relation is not explained by means of a higher source from which they both drew, or whether the fourth evangelist was really formed in the school of the Alexandrian philosopher.[1]

In this last case, there may be differences of detail between them, undoubtedly, but the same general tendency will necessarily be found in them both. Now, there is nothing of this. The notion of the Logos is for Philo a metaphysical theory; with John, a fact of Divine love. For the former, God, being raised above all particular determination, is not apprehensible by the human reason, and cannot communicate with matter except by means of the being in whom He manifests Himself; the Logos is the Divine reason, which conceives finite things and realizes them in the material world. With John, on the contrary, the idea of this being is a postulate of eternal love. "For thou didst love me before the creation of the world" (xvii. 24); and to this love of God for the Logos corresponds that of the Logos for God Himself: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God;" literally, tended to God, moved toward God. There is no secondary difference here; we are in the presence of two different tendencies;—on the one side, that of philosophical speculation, the need of knowing; on the other, that of piety, the need of salvation. Not that I would say that all piety is wanting to Philo, and all need of knowing to John. The question here is of the point of support of the two teachings in the souls of the two writers.

With this fundamental difference is connected the following fact: The doctrine of the Logos with Philo has its value in itself, as an idea indispensable to human speculation; with John, this idea is only at the service of an historical fact, a means of explaining the divine element which the author perceived in the person of Jesus Christ. Réville complains several times of the fact that the speculative data respecting the nature and activity of the Logos "are extremely limited in the prologue of John . . . A little more speculation, for the clearness of the narrative, would not have been misplaced" (pp. 37, 38). This charge is *naïve;* the young writer demands of the fourth Gospel that it should be what it ought to have been, assuredly, if it were that which he would desire it to be. He wishes to make of it a philosophical work, and, as it does not respond to this demand, he censures it instead of turning his criticism

[1] Let us recall to mind the fact that Philo lived in the first century of our era, and that he was a member of a rich Jewish family of Alexandria. He wrote a multitude of treatises on philosophical and religious subjects, in which he tries to show the relation between the Jewish beliefs and the Greek philosophies, especially those of Plato and the Stoics.

against his own theory. There is no philosophical speculation in the prologue; there is simply a conception of the person of Jesus expressed by means of a term which was current at that period in the philosophical language.

And further, this term is taken in a wholly different sense from that which it has in speculation generally, and in that of Philo in particular. With the latter, the word Logos is used in the sense of *reason;* it denotes the Divine reason, whether residing in God or as realized in the world of finite beings—in the sense in which the Stoics spoke of reason diffused through all beings (*ὁ κοινὸς λόγος ὁ διὰ πάντων ἐρχόμενος*). Thus Philo calls it sometimes the idea of ideas (*ἰδέα ἰδεῶν*) or the metropolis of ideas. It is the ideal of the finite world, in its whole and in its details, as existing in the divine understanding. With John, the term Logos is evidently taken in the sense of *word;* this is its constant meaning throughout the Gospel, where it denotes the divine revelation, and even in the prologue, where the creative word of Genesis is personified under this name. When Philo wishes to express this idea, he adds to the word Logos (reason) the term *ῥῆμα* (*word*, in the special sense of the word). Thus in this passage: "God creates the one and the other (the heaven and the earth) *τῷ ἑαυτοῦ λόγῳ ῥήματι* (by his own *Logos-word*)." Or he uses only the second term: "The whole world was made *διὰ ῥήματος τοῦ αἰτίου* (by the *word, the cause* of things)." This difference arises from the fact that Philo moves in the sphere of speculation, John in that of the divine action for the salvation of humanity.

How different, also, the part played by the Logos in the one and in the other! The Logos of Philo is a universal principle, the general law of things; it is not placed in any relation to the person of the Messiah; while, with John, the Messiah is Himself this incarnate Word, the gift which the Father makes to the world and by means of which He comes to save it. The mere supposition of the incarnation of the Logos would be, whatever Réville may say, an enormity to the view of Philo. Does not sin arise from matter, and does not the defilement of the human soul result from its connection with a body? What blasphemy, therefore, would it not be, to represent the Logos as having appeared in a human person having a soul and body! The Messiah of Philo is, also, only a simple man who will bring back the Jews from their dispersion and will restore to them the glorious state to which they are entitled.

In the spiritual world itself the part sustained by the Logos differs entirely in the conception of Philo from what it is in that of John. With the latter, the Logos is the *light of men* (i. 4), and, if there is darkness in the world, it is because the world has not known Him—Him who continues to act in His creation by *illuminating every man* (vv. 9, 10). To the view of Philo, the Logos is indeed the interpreter of God, but not for the men who belong to the rank of *the perfect.* The true sage rises by the act of immediate contemplation even to the knowledge of God, without depending on the aid of the Logos. The Logos is the God of the imperfect, who, not being able to rise as far as the model, must be content to contemplate the portrait. The Logos of Philo, says Gess, is a guide who does

not lead to the end, to God Himself; a God, in whom one does not possess the real God. To speculate is to work on the Logos, on the Divine reason manifested in the world; but, on this path, one will by no means reach God Himself; one comes to Him only by the way of immediate intuition, which passes one side of the Logos. Here is not the Logos of the fourth Gospel, in which Jesus says: "I am the way, the truth and the life; no one cometh to the Father but by me."

Finally, the intention of the theory of the Logos with Philo is to preserve God from all compromising contact with the material world. God is an absolutely transcendent being who cannot, without derogation, unite Himself with the finite world. Réville, indeed, cites a certain number of cases where God seems endowed with goodness and grace, and acts by Himself in the finite world. This is a remnant of the influence exercised on the thought of the Jewish philosopher by the living monotheism of the Old Testament. We might add such passages to the innumerable proofs of inconsistency which are found in the speculation of Philo; but it is also possible that he attributes these divine communications to the action of God confounded with that of the Logos. The Divine being, with John—He whom he calls absolutely *God*—is not an indeterminable essence; He is a person full of will, of activity, of love; He is *the Father*, who loves not only the Son whom He sacrifices, but also the world to which He gives Him; who, by an inward teaching and an attraction exercised on human individuals, *brings* them to the Son Himself; "No man," says Jesus, "can come to me except the Father who hath sent me *draw him* . . . All that the Father *giveth me*, shall come to me" (John vi. 44 and 37). This Father "Himself beareth witness to the Son" through acts wrought in the domain of matter, the miracles (v. 36). He even causes to resound in the temple an outwardly perceptible voice in answer to a prayer of Jesus (xii. 28). Thus the conception of John is so completely the opposite to that of Philo, that it makes of the Father an intermediate agent between Jesus and men, so that Jesus can utter those words, which would have been, for Philo, the height of absurdity: "Thine they were, and Thou gavest them me" (xvii. 6).[1]

The difference between John and Philo is so profound, that Gess, the one who has most thoroughly studied them both, has said: "He who believes that he can unite in one the thought of John and that of Philo, understands nothing either of John or of Philo."[2] It is not in certain details only, it is in the tendency itself, that they differ. And yet there are between the two, as we have seen, certain analogies of which it is necessary

[1] See Gess, II., p. 642 ff.

[2] The defenders of the theory which we contend against are so dominated by their preconceived idea, that they even fashion after their own fancy, without hesitation, the texts which they quote. Thus we have pointed out that error of Colani, who, quoting the prayer of Jesus, John xii. 28, makes him say: "Father, glorify *my* name," instead of "glorify *thy* name" (see our second ed., vol. III., p. 282). It happens that Réville commits a similar mistake in quoting the same verse: "A voice came from heaven and said: 'I have both glorified *thee*, and will also glorify *thee* [thee, Jesus],' while the actual voice said: 'I have both glorified *it*, and will also glorify *it* [my name].'"

to find the cause. But is it so difficult to discover it? Are not Philo and John, both of them, Jews, reared in the school of the law and the prophets?

Three converging lines in the Old Testament lead to a single end: 1. The notion of the *Word* of God, as a manifestation of His all powerful and creative will in the finite world. Very frequently this principle of action in God is even personified in the Old Testament. Thus when, in Ps. cvii. 20, it is said: "He sendeth His Word, and it healeth them," or Ps. cxlvii. 15: "He sendeth His Word on the earth, and it runneth swiftly;" or Is. lv. 11: "My Word shall do all the things for which I have sent it." There is evidently here, however, only a poetic personification. 2. The notion of *wisdom* in the book of Proverbs, especially in chap. viii. The author represents it as itself describing what it is for God: "He possessed me from the beginning of his way, before his works . . .; I was a workman with him, and I was his delight continually." Still a mere poetic personification, surely. The word is a power of action; wisdom, an intelligence and a conceived plan. 3. In several passages of Genesis, a being is spoken of in whom Jehovah Himself appears in the sensible world. He is sometimes distinguished from Him by the name *Angel of the Lord*, sometimes confounded with Him by the way in which He expresses Himself, saying: *I*, in speaking of Jehovah Himself. Some theologians see in him only an ordinary angel,—not always the same one, perhaps,—each time accomplishing a special mission. Others even deny Him personality, and see in Him only a sensible form, the passing mode of appearance of Jehovah Himself. These two interpretations are wrecked against the passage, Exod. xxiii. 21, where God, in speaking of this Angel of the Lord, says: "Beware! For he will not pardon your sin; *my name* is in him." The name is the reflection of the essence. Here this name is the reflection of the holy essence of God, inflexible towards the will which is obstinate in sinning. Such a quality implies personality. The question, therefore, is of a real person, having a divine character, and in whom God Himself manifests Himself (*my name—in him*). This angel is also called by Isaiah (lxiii. 9): "*The Angel of the Presence*" of Jehovah, and Malachi, at the end of the Old Testament, taking the final step, identifies him with the Messiah: "Suddenly the Lord whom ye seek and the Angel of the Covenant whom ye desire shall enter into his temple; behold, he cometh, saith the Lord of hosts." In this third idea we find no longer only the divine intelligence or force personified, but a living divine being, Him who should come to save his people as Messiah.—These so remarkable indications did not remain unnoticed by the ancient Jewish doctors. They appear to have early endeavored to bring together these three lines into a single idea; that of the being of whom God makes use on every occasion when He puts Himself in connection with the external world. They designate Him sometimes by the names *Shekinah* (*habitation*), or *Jekara* (*brightness*), sometimes, and most frequently, by the name *Memar* or *Memra di Jehovah* (*Word of the Lord*). The Chaldaic paraphrases of the Old Testament, called *Targums*, constantly introduce this being where the Old Testament speaks simply of the Lord. These writings, perhaps, date only from the third or

fourth century of our era, it is true; but, as Schürer says, it is beyond doubt that these paraphrases rest upon more ancient works, and are the product of an elaboration for ages. Fragments of similar writings are preserved, dating from the second century *before* Jesus Christ, from the time of John Hyrcanus. Already before the fall of Jerusalem, mention is made of a Targum on the book of Job, and the Mischna (of the second century after Jesus Christ) already speaks of translations of the Bible into Chaldee.[1] It is infinitely improbable, moreover, that the Jewish theologians would have accepted from the Christians a notion so favorable to the religion of the latter. Now, the following are some examples of the manner in which these doctors paraphrase the Old Testament. It is said in Gen. xxi. 20, in speaking of Ishmael: "God was with the lad;" the paraphrase says: "The Word of Jehovah was with the lad." xxviii. 21, where Jacob says: "The Lord shall be my God;" the Targum makes him say: "The Word of Jehovah shall be my God." xxxix. 21, instead of "The Lord was with Joseph," . . . "the Memra (the Word) was with Joseph." Exod. xix. 17, instead of "And Moses brought forth the people to meet God" . . . "And Moses brought forth the people to meet the Word of Jehovah." Num. xxii. 20, instead of "God came unto Balaam." . . . "The Word of Jehovah came unto Balaam." Deut. iv. 24, instead of "God is a consuming fire." . . . "The Word of Jehovah is a consuming fire." Is. i. 14, instead of "My soul hateth your new moons." . . . "My Word hateth," . . . xlii. 1, instead of "My soul delighteth in him." . . . "My Word delighteth," . . . etc., etc. It is therefore indisputable that, at the time when John wrote, the Jewish theology had already, by the special name of *Word*, definitely expressed the idea of the God who enters into connection with the external world. It will have been noticed that this form is particularly used in the passages in which the Scriptures ascribe to God a human feeling, such as that of repenting, of aversion, of complacency, of hatred.

The question now is to determine whether these doctors represented this manifested God to themselves as a real person and distinct from the person of God Himself. There can be brought forward in relation to this point, just as in relation to the nature of the Logos of Philo, passages having opposite meanings. Gess regards as incompatible with the notion of a real person the passage 1 Kings viii. 15, in which the Targum substitutes for the expressions, *the mouth* and *the hand* of Jehovah, the following: *the Word* (*Memar*) and *the will* of Jehovah, the first as declaring, the second as executing. In the same way, Jer. xxxii. 41, or again Gen. xxii. 16, where the Targum makes the Lord say: "I swear by my Word," instead of: "I swear by myself." But is it necessary to suppose the paraphrasts systematically consistent with themselves in a region so mysterious and obscure? Besides, it appears to me much more difficult to explain how God should swear by His Word, if it is not a person like Himself, than if it is a personal being; and as to the first passage, the term

[1] Schürer, *Lehrbuch des neutest. Zeitgeschichte*, p. 479.

Word seems to regain its ordinary meaning, since the two terms *word* and *will* correspond to the two acts: speaking and acting. It is impossible not to find the idea of personality in all the following passages: "My Word *hates*," "My Word *has pleasure*," "the Word shall be *my God*;" "the Word shall contend for you;" "the Brightness of Jehovah arose *and said*." So much the more, since in several passages, instead of the Word or the Brightness of Jehovah, it is the Angel of the Lord who is substituted for the simple name of Jehovah, for example, Exod. iv. 24, and Judges iv. 14. Gess objects that if this theory of a second divine person, called the Word of Jehovah, had been received in Palestine at that period, it could not be altogether wanting in the writings of St. Paul. But the teaching of that apostle is drawn from the revelation which he had received, and not from the lessons of his early masters. Paul may not have found in the region where he taught, and at the time when he taught, a call to use this term, while in the great centre, Ephesus, at the end of the first century, John found himself in circumstances which drew his particular attention to this term. The passages 1 Cor. viii. 6, where creation is attributed to Christ, and 1 Cor. x. 5, where Christ is represented as the leader of Israel in the wilderness, show in any case that the notion itself was as familiar to him as it was to John; and this is the essential point.

If the point is carefully considered, the paraphrasts, in denying to God all human emotions, in order to attribute them to the *Memar* (the Word), give in fact to this manifested God the seal of personality in even a much more pronounced way than to God Himself. But perhaps it is with them, as with Philo, whose idea respecting the personality of the Logos seems to be quite fluctuating. Zeller has clearly shown the cause of this oscillation in the mind of this philosopher. On one side, the Logos must appertain to the essence of God, which seems to make him a simple divine attribute (the divine reason or wisdom), and consequently to exclude personality; on the other side, he must be in relation with matter, in order to cause the particular types to penetrate it on which finite things are formed, and this function supposes a being distinct from God, and, consequently, personal. A similar observation may be made with regard to the oriental paraphrasts; and this correspondence between them would have nothing surprising in it if, as Schürer thinks, Philo's philosophy exercised an influence on the exegesis of these latter.[1]

We may now conclude. Philo was formed, above all, in the school of the Old Testament; he had learned in it, through all the facts which we have pointed out above, the existence of a being, personal or impersonal, by means of whom God acts upon the world, when He puts Himself in connection with it. And he believed that he could philosophically interpret the idea of this being, through explaining it by means of the Logos, or divine reason, of the Greek philosophers. For this reason he calls him sometimes *Logos* or *second God* (*δεύτερος θεός*) when he speaks as a disciple

[1] Schürer, *Literatur-Zeitung*, 1878, No. 17.

of these schools, and sometimes *Archangel, High-priest, Son, First-born Son,* when he resumes the Jewish language. So true is it that the Porch and the Academy furnished him the key of his Judaism, that in one instance he even goes so far as to say: "the immortal *ideas* (ἀθάνατοι λόγοι) which we [Jews] call *angels.*"

John, on his side, was also in the school of the Old Testament; he also learned from this sacred book the existence of that being, sometimes distinct from the Lord, sometimes confounded with Him, with whom God conversed when He said: "*Let us make* man in our image," who consequently participated in the creative act, who communicates life to all things, but who has especially marked with His luminous impress every human soul, who finally is the permanent agent in the theophanies of the Old Testament. John is so penetrated by this view, that in the person of Adonai, *the Lord,* who calls Isaiah (chap. vi.) to the prophetic ministry, he recognizes the same divine being who, at a later time, in Jesus Christ manifested His glory in a human life (John xii. 41);[1] exactly as St. Paul recognizes the divine being, manifested in Christ, in the leader of Israel through the wilderness (1 Cor. x. 4), and as the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, finally, attributes to the Son the creation and preservation of all things, as well as the sacrifice of purification for our sins (Heb. i. 1–3).

But here is the difference between John and Philo: instead of going from the Old Testament to the schools of Plato and the Stoics, John passed to that of Jesus. And when he beheld in Him that unique glory, full of divine grace and truth, which he has described John i. 14—when he heard declarations such as these: "He who hath seen me, hath seen the Father;" "Thou didst love me before the foundation of the world;" "Before Abraham was, I am;" he comprehended what He whom he had before him was, and without difficulty accomplished, in his mind, that fusion between the eternal agent of God and the Christ, which had not entered into the mind of the Alexandrian philosopher. Philo is the Old Testament explained by Greek philosophy; John is the Old Testament completed and explained by Jesus Christ.[2]

As for the *term* Logos, on which John fixed in order to designate the divine being whom he had recognized in the person of Christ, it was offered to him, as we have seen, by the Old Testament; the part which the Word of God plays in that book, particularly in the account of the creation, was sufficient to make him prefer this term to every other. That of *Son,* as Gess rightly says, only expressed the personal relation between God and the divine being whom John wished to characterize. The

[1] "Isaiah said these things when he saw his glory and spake of him [Christ]."

[2] We see how many errors are included in the opinion of Jean Réville, which may be thus stated: "The Alexandrian theology is the synthesis of Judaism and Greek philosophy, and the doctrine of John is, in its turn, the synthesis of this Alexandrian theology with the Christian tradition." We believe that the Alexandrian theology is foreign to John's teaching, and that this teaching, instead of resting on the Christian tradition, is a personal testimony (John i. 14; 1 John i. 1–4).

term *Word*, on the contrary, expressed His double relation, on one side to the God who reveals Himself in Him, and on the other to the world to which He manifests Himself. And if this name of Word was already used in the Jewish schools (as seems to be shown by the paraphrases), we may so much more easily understand how it may have been the first one which presented itself to the apostle's mind. It is remarkable that this title is found as a designation of Christ in the three Johannean writings (Gosp. i. 1; 1 Ep. i. 1–3; Apoc. xix. 13), and in these three writings alone. It is, as it were, an indissoluble bond which unites them. The fact that this name is found even in the Apocalypse, whose author, assuredly, is not liable to the suspicion of Alexandrianism, completes the proof that its source is Jewish, and by no means Philonean. Finally, being established at Ephesus, that focus of religious syncretism, whither all the philosophical doctrines flowed in from Persia, from Greece and from Egypt, John might have often heard, in the religious and philosophical teachings or conversations, the term *Word* applied to the *manifested God*. When he inscribed it at the beginning of his narrative, therefore, it was as if he had said: "This Logos, respecting whom you are speculating, without coming to the real knowledge of Him, we possess, we Christians. We have seen and heard Him Himself, and He it is whose history we are about to relate to you."[1]

We see, consequently, that there is nothing compromising to the Johannean origin of the fourth Gospel in this term Logos, to which criticism clings with tenacity, and which it uses in a way that does little honor to its scientific impartiality.

IX. After having done justice to all these considerations, Hase avows himself overpowered by a ninth and last one, namely this: Certain incidents in our Gospel have a legendary stamp, and cannot have been related by an eye-witness; thus, the picture of John the Baptist and the first disciples of Jesus, the change of the water into wine and the multiplication of the loaves, finally, the appearances of Jesus after He rose from the dead. Hase, for a long time, believed that he could escape the force of this consideration by holding that John was not present when the facts occurred which gave rise to these legends. He now acknowledges that this was a forced expedient, and lays down his arms. The reply attempted by this theologian was, in fact, only a poor subterfuge, and he did well to renounce it. But the argument before which the veteran of Jena gives way, is of no more importance for that reason; for, however Hase may think he can affirm the contrary, it simply amounts to the question of the supernatural.

X. Baur has especially insisted upon the argument derived from the

[1] Neander, *Apost. Zeitalter*, ii. p. 549: "John wished to lead those who were occupying themselves too much with speculations about the Logos, from their idealism to a religious realism. . . Instead of exploring that which is hidden and cannot be attained, each one should come and behold Him who had manifested Himself in human nature;—to believe and test by experience, as John himself testified of what he had seen and experienced."

Paschal dispute at the end of the second century, but from a different point of view from that from which we have already treated this question (p. 172). He claims that in fixing on the 14th of Nisan as the day of Christis death, which the Synoptics placed on the 15th, the author of the fourth Gospel sought to completely put an end to the Paschal rite of the churches of Asia, which celebrated the Passover on the 14th in the evening. In fact, he displaces thus the day of the last meal of Christ and carries it back to the evening of the 13th. Now, as it was at that meal that Jesus instituted the Passover, the author creates thereby a conflict between the Gospel history and the Asiatic rite. And as John must have been the author of that rite, he cannot have composed a Gospel designed to contest it. This argument rests on the idea that an annual commemorative festival is celebrated on the day on which that feast was *instituted*, and not the day on which the event that gave rise to it occurred. Every one at once perceives the falsity of this view. Besides, we have already shown that the narrative of John respecting this point is historically justified, and that by the Synoptics themselves (p. 78). It was not invented, therefore, in the service of ecclesiastical tactics. The rite of the churches of Asia probably depended, not on any date whatever in the history of the Passion, but on the day of the Paschal meal in the Old Covenant. In any case, if the evangelist had desired to favor the Roman Church, which celebrated the Holy Paschal Supper on the Sunday of the resurrection, and to combat the Asiatic rite which placed it on the evening of the 14th, it would have served no purpose to place the institution of the Holy Supper on the 13th, at evening;—to reach this end, it would have been necessary to place it on Sunday morning, and to make it the first act of Jesus after His resurrection! (See, for further details, the Commentary, at the end of chap. xix.)

XI. The difference of matter and form between the Gospel and the *Apocalypse.* The impossibility of referring these two works to the same author had formerly become a kind of axiom for criticism. Consequently, it was thought that, as the Apocalypse has in its favor earlier and more positive testimonies than the Gospel, it was just to give it the preference and to reject the Johannean origin of the latter. Thus even Baur, Hilgenfeld and many others reason. But the dilemma on which this conclusion rests is more and more doubted at present. It is positively set aside by Hase, who cites, as an analogy, the difference which is so marked between the first and second parts of Goethe's *Faust;* more than this, he thinks that the Apocalypse, bearing testimony to John's residence in Asia, rather confirms thereby the tradition relative to the Gospel.[1] Weizsäcker cannot help acknowledging that, notwithstanding the difference of author, the Apocalypse is "in organic connection with the spirit of the Gospel."[2] Baur himself has borne witness to the complete identity of the two works, by calling the Johannean Gospel "a spiritualized Apocalypse." If, indeed, it can be proved that it is necessary to interpret spiritually the poetic images and plastic forms of the Apocalypse, wherein, according to this declaration of Baur

[1] *Geschichte Jesu*, pp. 29–31. [2] *Untersuch.*, p. 295.

himself, will it differ from the Gospel? Let us add that the superiority which is attributed to the testimony of tradition in relation to the Apocalypse is a fiction, which does not become more true for being continually repeated.[1] Keim and Scholten find the Apocalypse as insufficiently attested as the Gospel, and reject them both.

In our view, a choice between these works is by no means necessary, for they bear distinctly the seal of their composition by one and the same author.

And (1) from the standpoint of *style*. The charge made against the author of the Apocalypse of transgressing the rules of grammar or of Greek syntax, is one of those mistakes which it would be well not to repeat any further. The preposition *ἀπό from* is construed with the nominatives *ὁ ὢν* (*who is*) and *ὁ ἐρχόμενος* (*who is to come*). A barbarism! cries the critic. The Gospel, on the contrary, is written in correct Greek. But in the same verse, i. 4, we find this same preposition *ἀπό from*, construed regularly with the genitive *τῶν ἑπτὰ πνευμάτων* (*the seven spirits*). And the same is the case, without a single exception, throughout all the rest of the book! The construction which is found fault with, far from being a schoolboy's error, is, therefore, the bold anomaly of a master who wished to picture, by the immutability of the word, the immutability of the subject designated, namely God. Numbers of appositions in the nominative with substantives in the genitive or dative are charged. Comp. ii. 20 (Tisch.) iii. 12, etc. But constantly we find in the same book appositions in their regular cases (comp. i. 10, 11; iii. 10, etc.). In the cases of the opposite kind, the author, in setting grammar at defiance, has evidently desired to give a greater independence to the appositional substantive or participle. The Gospel, in several instances, offers us analogous irregularities (comp. vi. 39; xvii. 2, etc.).—It is remarked further that the Gospel uses abstract terms, where the Apocalypse is disposed to clothe the idea with a figure. The one will say *life*, where the other says *living fountains of waters;* the one *light*, where the other says *the lamp of the holy city;* the one *the world*, the other *the Gentiles;* the one *death*, the other *the second death*, etc., etc. It is sufficient, as a complete answer, to call to mind, with Hase, that "the Apocalypse employs the forms of poetry which are sensible (*sinnlich*)." Let us, also, not forget that the Apocalypse is the work of ecstasy and of vision, and that John conceived it *ἐν πνεύματι* (*carried away in the spirit*), while the Gospel is the calm and deliberate reproduction of simple historical recollections, and that it is written *ἐν νοί* (in an unexcited state of mind).[2]—The Aramaisms of the Apocalypse are also spoken of, which form a contrast with the Greek accuracy of the Gospel. Account must here be taken of a decisive fact. The Apocalypse is written under the constant influence of the prophetic pictures of the Old Testament, the coloring of whose style, as a conse-

[1] The question is especially of the testimony which Justin gives to the Apocalypse; now, we have seen what follows, in favor of the Gospel, from the testimony of the same Justin, from that of Papias and from that of the twenty-first chapter.

[2] Comp. respecting this difference, 1 Cor. xiv. 14, 15.

quence, comes out in its own style, while the Gospel simply relates the events of which the author was a witness, independently of every foreign model. Under these so very different conditions of redaction, as the Dutch critic Niermeyer justly observes,[1] the entire absence of difference between the two writings (on the supposition that they are both by the same author) would "afford ground for legitimate astonishment." Winer has remarked how the style of Josephus has a more Aramaic coloring when he relates the history of the Old Testament, and when he is under the influence of the sacred writings, than when he describes, in the *Jewish War*, the events which happened under his own eyes.—But with all this, what real and fundamental homogeneousness of style between these two works, to the view of every one who does not stop at the surface! We recommend, in this regard, the excellent study of Niermeyer (see p. 23 f). The same favorite expressions, *to make a lie, to do the truth; to keep the commandments*, or *the word; to hunger and thirst*, to designate the deep wants of the soul; the term *Amen, Amen*, which so often begins the declarations of Jesus in the fourth Gospel, becoming in the Apocalypse the personal name of Christ Himself; the figure of the *Lamb*, applied in the Gospel (with the term ἀμνός) to the victim burdened with the sin of the world, and used in the Apocalypse, with the neuter and more emphatic term ἀρνίον, in order to designate the glorified Lord and to form the counterpart of the term θηρίον, the Beast. Finally, the name Word or Word of God, given to Christ, which belongs only to the three Johannean writings in the entire New Testament, and unites them, as it were, by an indissoluble bond. To these analogies of expression let us add that of entire descriptions; for example, Apoc. iii. 20, where the author describes the intimate communion of Christ with the believer: "Behold, I stand at the door and knock; if any one hear my voice and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me." Let this expression be compared with John xiv., more particularly with the 23d verse: "We will come to him and make our abode with him." Or the description of the heavenly happiness of believers, Apoc. vii. 15–17: "And he that sitteth on the throne shall dwell with them. They shall hunger no more, and they shall thirst no more . . . . , because the Lamb who is in the midst of the throne shall feed them and shall lead them to living fountains of waters, and God shall wipe away every tear from their eyes." We find here brought together several characteristic expressions of the Johannean style: σκηνοῦν ἐν (*to dwell in a tent*), comp. John i. 14; πεινᾶν, διψᾶν (*to hunger, to thirst*), comp. vi. 35; ποιμαίνειν (*to feed*) x. 1–16; xxi. 16; ὁδηγεῖν (*to guide*) xvi. 13; and as to the last point, depicting God's tenderness, does it not recall the expression of Jesus, xiv. 21: "He that loveth me shall be loved of my Father?"—A final analogy, which sets the seal on the preceding, is found in the quotation from Zechariah (xii. 10), Apoc. i. 7, where the author corrects the translation of the LXX. precisely as the author of the Gospel does, in John xix. 37.

[1] Statement by Busken-Huet, *Revue de théologie*, Sept., 1856.

2. With regard to the *matter*, the agreement between the two writings is no less remarkable.

It has been sometimes said that the God of the Apocalypse is a God of wrath, while the God of the Gospel is all love. It seems to be forgotten that it is in the Gospel that this threatening is found: "He that obeyeth not the Son, the wrath of God abideth on him" (iii. 36), and that other threatening: "Ye shall seek me, but ye shall die in your sins" (viii. 24); and, on the other hand, that it is the author of the Apocalypse who twice reproduces (vii. 17 and xxi. 4) that promise of Isaiah—the most tender of all which the Scriptures contain: "God shall wipe every tear from their eyes." Love rules in the Gospel, because this book describes the first coming of the Son of God, as *Saviour;* severity in the Apocalypse, because it is the representation of the second coming of the Son, as *Judge.*

The Christology of the Apocalypse is identical with that of the Gospel. We have already shown (p. 113) that the designation of Christ as ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ θεοῦ, *the beginning of the creation of God* (iii. 14), must not be understood in the sense of a temporal beginning, as if Jesus Himself formed a part of the creation, but in the sense in which eternity may be called the beginning, that is to say, the principle of the creation. This sense follows from the passages in which the term *beginning* (ἀρχή) is completed by the term *end* (τέλος) and in which the parallel epithet, *the first*, is also completed by *the last.* We must recall to mind the fact that these expressions are borrowed from Isaiah, with whom they are, as it were, the insignia of the peculiar glory of Jehovah. If Jesus Himself formed part of the creation, according to the author of the Apocalypse, as Hilgenfeld claims, how could he call Him ὁ ζῶν, *the living one* (i. 18)? This word reminds one of the expressions of the Gospel, i. 4: "In him was life," and vi. 51: "I am the living bread," a term which, in the context, implies the sense of *life-giving.* The homage of worship from all creatures is addressed to the Lamb at the same time as to the Father (v. 15); a fact which may fitly be compared with xxii. 9: "Worship *God* (only)." But, at the same time, the Son is subordinate to the Father. As for the revelation "which He gives to His servants," in this very book, it is "God who gave it to Him" (i. 1). In the Gospel, Jesus declares also that it is "the Father who giveth the Son to have life in Himself" (v. 26), and that "His Father is greater than He" (xiv. 28). The terms *Word* and *Son*, which are common to the two works, both of them imply this double notion of dependence and community of nature.

The means of *justification* before God are absolutely the same in the two works; there is no question in the Apocalypse either of circumcision, or of any legal work. "Salvation" descends "from the throne of God and of the Lamb" as a divine gift (vii. 10). The same figure is applied to the *river of living water* (xxii. 1). It is "in the *blood of the Lamb* that the elect wash their robes" (viii. 14); it is "through this blood that they gain the victory over Satan" (xii. 11). Justification and sanctification are, therefore, the fruit of faith in the work of Christ. If the keeping of the *commandments of God* is frequently spoken of, the case is exactly the same in

the Gospel (xiv. 21; xv. 10) and in the first epistle (v. 2, etc.). And it is very evident that this obedience is that which springs from faith. Critics especially urge the reproach addressed to the bishop of Pergamos, of tolerating persons who, "after the example of Balaam, teach men *to eat meats sacrificed to idols* and to commit fornication" (ii. 14). The teaching thus made the subject of accusation is none other, it is said, than that of St. Paul in First Corinthians (viii.–x.). Here, therefore, is a declaration of war made against Paulinism, and the evident indication of a Judaizing tendency; it is the antipode of the fourth Gospel. But one and the same thing may be said in two very different spirits. Paul in 1 Cor. begins by permitting, in the name of monotheism and the freedom of faith, the eating of the meats sacrificed to idols; the Christian should not be afraid of contracting defilement from material food; but afterwards he restricts this permission in two ways: 1. The exercise of this right is subordinate to the duty of charity towards brethren having conscientious scruples; 2. It must never be carried to the point of participation in the sacred feasts celebrated in the heathen sanctuaries, because such an act implies a close union with idolatry (x. 14–21), and because in such circumstances the believer "who thinks that he stands" may easily fall (1 Cor. x. 12). Evidently he means by this: fall into impurity—that vice which was so prevalent in Corinth and against which he had just put the members of the Church on their guard, in chap. vi. Now it is precisely against this second manner of eating the sacrificial meats that the author of the Apocalypse also raises his voice, as is shown by the close connection which is made between these two expressions: *to eat meats sacrificed to idols* and *to commit fornication*. What temptation to this latter vice could have resulted from the fact of eating such food at a private table, either that of the Christian himself, or at the house of a brother who had invited him! And this is the only thing which Paul authorizes (1 Cor. x. 25–27). We know, on the contrary, that, towards the end of the first century, and from the beginnings of Gnosticism, the heretics set about recommending the eating of meats sacrificed to idols, precisely in the sense in which Paul had prohibited it. They sought thereby to reconcile Christianity with Paganism. Irenæus says (i. 6): "They eat without scruple the meats which have been sacrificed to idols, thinking that they do not defile themselves thereby, and whenever there is among the heathen a festival prepared in honor of the idols, they are the first to be there." We can understand the falls which resulted from this. Irenæus also immediately adds, "that these Gnostics give themselves up to the lusts of the flesh with greediness;" and when the Jew Trypho reproaches Justin with the fact that the Christians eat sacrificial meats, the latter replies, unhesitatingly, that "it is only the Valentinians and other heretics who act in this way." Basilides taught, according to the report of Eusebius (*H. E.*, iv. 7), that, in time of persecution, one might, in order to save one's life, eat sacrificial meats and deny the faith. The first of these acts was only the outward form of the second. These are the abominations against which the author of the Apocalypse protests. What have they in common with the case which is

authorized by Paul? We have discussed this passage at considerable length, because it is one of the principal supports on which the opinion rests, which is so widely extended at the present day, as to the Judaizing character of the Apocalypse.

It has been maintained that when the author puts the Church of Ephesus on its guard "against those who say they are apostles and are not, and has found them liars," he means to designate St. Paul. But what! in a letter addressed to a Church which Paul had founded during a residence of three years, and from which Christianity had spread through all the countries of the neighborhood, a man dared to maintain that the apostleship of this man was an untruth! Was it not in that region of Asia Minor that there were found those multitudes of converts due to the labor of the apostle, whose triumph the author of the Apocalypse celebrates in chap. vii. and elsewhere? Luthardt simply says, in answer to such an assertion: "He who proves too much proves nothing." Volkmar has made another discovery: the false prophet, the beast with the horns of a lamb, the confederate of the antichrist, who seeks to bring the whole world under the power of the latter, is again St. Paul; for in the Epistle to the Romans (chap. xiii.), he teaches Christians the duty of submitting themselves to the superior powers, which is equivalent to binding them to assume the mark of the beast. Is not this a poor jest, rather than a serious argument? The way of submission marked out by Paul is that which the entire Scriptures teach with regard to earthly powers. It was that which Jeremiah marked out for the last kings of Judah towards Nebuchadnezzar. Jesus knows no other: "Put up thy sword into the sheath, for he that smiteth with the sword shall perish by the sword." The author of the Apocalypse himself recommends it to the Christians persecuted by the antichrist, for he sets in opposition to every desire for active resistance this threatening: "If any one leadeth into captivity, into captivity he shall go: if any one slayeth with the sword, he also shall be killed with the sword. Here is the *patience* and *faith* of the saints." The strength of the persecuted Church will be, as Isaiah already said, *to keep itself at rest*, relying upon God alone. The Reformed Church in France has carried this line of conduct even to heroism, and, when it has for a time departed from it, it has had no occasion to congratulate itself.

As to the conception of *the Church*, it is absolutely the same in the Apocalypse as in the fourth Gospel and with St. Paul; and it is a gross error to maintain, as Volkmar does, that the believing Gentiles are only *tolerated*, in this book, and constitute only a sort of *plebs* in the Holy City. As Hase says: "After the one hundred and forty-four thousand who are sealed from among the tribes of Israel, John sees an innumerable multitude from the twelve Gentiles, of every nation, of every tribe, of every tongue, clothed with white robes" (chap. vii.). "They are before the throne of God and serve him night and day in his temple," and "God dwells with them . . . and He wipes away every tear from their eyes" (vv. 15–17). Is this the reception given to a vile plebs? This assertion is so entirely false, that the one hundred and forty-four thousand Jews, who are

previously spoken of, are not even yet believers. Their conversion is not related until chap. xiv. 1 ff. In chap. vii. they are merely *sealed* (reserved) in order to be consecrated afterwards. But, however it may be with this last point, and even if these one hundred and forty-four thousand formed the *élite* of the assembly of the Church, the Apocalypse in giving them this place would be in agreement with St. Paul, who, in the eleventh chapter of Romans, compares the converted Gentiles to wild branches grafted upon the patriarchal root in the place of the Jews, the natural branches; and also with the author of the fourth Gospel, who, in chap. x., makes the sheep taken from the Israelitish fold the centre of the Church and presents the sheep called from other nations as simply grouped about this primitive nucleus (ver. 16). The divine work which the author of the Apocalypse celebrates from the beginning to the end, when he puts into the mouth of all believers, without distinction, the song of the Lamb; when he gives to them all the titles of *kings* and *priests* of God the Father, which Israel had borne only typically; when to the twelve elders representing the twelve tribes of Israelitish Christianity, he adds twelve others perfectly equal to the first, and representing, together with them, before the throne the Christians of the Gentile world,—all this new creation which he beholds with rapture and which he glorifies, is nothing else than the work of St. Paul. And yet in this book, St. Paul is the false prophet in the service of the antichrist!

But do not the author's *eschatological* views condemn us perchance? Even Niermeyer feels himself embarrassed by that *Jerusalem* of the end of time, which seems to perpetuate the preponderance of Judaism even in the perfected state of the kingdom of God. "If," says he, "the *earthly* Jerusalem could be removed from the Apocalyptic picture, this book would be *spiritualized* throughout by this fact alone." It is not difficult to satisfy this demand. The author represents (xxi. 16) the wall of that future Jerusalem as having a height equal to its length and its breadth, and as forming, consequently, a perfect cube. This cube is of twelve thousand furlongs, which is nearly fifty leagues, in each dimension. Can it reasonably be believed that he is picturing to himself a real city of so monstrous a shape? But this image, grotesque if we take it in a material sense, becomes sublime as soon as it is spiritually understood. The Most Holy Place in the tabernacle and in the temple had the form of a perfect cube, while the Holy Place had that of a rectangle. What, then, does the author mean by this figure? That the New Jerusalem will be wholly what the Most Holy Place was in the former times: the dwelling-place of the Thrice Holy God. It is the realization of the last prayer of Jesus: "That they may be one in us, as we are one;" the state which Paul sets forth in 1 Cor. xv. 28: "God all in all." And if any one hesitates to believe that this glorious state of things applies, in the Apocalypse, to other believers than those of Jewish origin, let him read, xxi. 2, 3, these words: "I saw the holy city, the New Jerusalem coming down out of heaven from God, and I heard a great voice from heaven saying, Behold the tabernacle of God *is among men.*" And as if to leave no doubt

respecting the sense of the word *men*, the author adds: "And they [they who were not his people] *shall be his peoples*, and God Himself shall be with them, their God." In speaking of the *final* Jerusalem, Niermeyer simply forgets that that future Jerusalem is by no means a restoration of the ancient Jerusalem, and that the author describes it as a *new* Jerusalem *coming down out of heaven from God*. It is the Church in all its extent and all its perfection, comprehending all that which, throughout the whole of humanity, has been given to Christ. We find here the widest universalism. And if it is thus with the holy city itself, the same method of spiritual interpretation must, of course, be extended to all that which constitutes its beauty: the gates, the walls, the square, the river, the trees. And all these images, spiritually understood, lead us directly, if the Gospel is really a spiritualized Apocalypse (Baur), to this result: that the Apocalypse is fundamentally identical with the Gospel.

A general comparison of the Apocalyptic *drama* with the narrative contained in our Gospel leads us also to hold that their author was the same. True, the contrary is affirmed. It is said that the Apocalypse breathes the most intense hatred towards the Gentiles—it is by a Jewish author; the Gospel reserves all its hatred for the Jews—it is by a Gentile author. It is further said, that the Apocalypse moves amidst the scenes of the last times, which are unknown to the Gospel; the latter, on the contrary, treats only of the hostile relation of Jesus to the Jews during His sojourn on the earth. These two objections fall before a single observation. The work of Jesus is twofold. In the first place it concerned the Jews; then came *the times of the Gentiles* in which salvation was offered to these last. The Gospel gives an account of the first of these relations, the Apocalypse treats of the second; and the two works complete each other, as if the two halves of one and the same whole, which might have for its title: The substitution of the kingdom of God for that of Satan throughout the whole earth. The actors in the two dramas are also, at the foundation, the same. They are these three: *Christ, faith, unbelief.* In the Gospel: the Christ, as Christ *in humiliation;* faith, represented by *the disciples;* unbelief, represented by *the Jews*. In the Apocalypse, the Christ, as the *glorified Lord;* faith, represented by *the Bride*, or the Church; unbelief, by *the Gentiles*, the majority of whom reject the call of the Gospel, in the same way as the majority of the Jews had rejected it in the time of Jesus. There is, therefore, no partiality in this book. On the one side, believing Gentiles, an innumerable multitude, whom the author with rapture beholds triumphant before the throne, precisely as, during the life of Jesus, there had been believing Jews, raised into the most intimate communion with Him. On the other side, a mass of unbelieving Gentiles who draw upon themselves, more and more, the judgments of the glorified Lord (seals, trumpets, bowls), precisely as the mass of the Jews had been hardened and infuriated more and more against the Lamb of God in the midst of them. The sole difference between the two dramas, the Evangelic and Apocalyptic—and this difference appertains to the very nature of things—is that in the former the Passion and Resur-

rection, the foundations of the redemption of all, are related; in the latter, the second coming of Christ, as the consummation of salvation and judgment for all. This difference is one more bond of union between the two works; for thereby the Apocalypse all along supposes the Gospel behind itself, so to speak, and the Gospel, the Apocalypse before itself, in some sort; and thus we understand from what source comes the almost complete absence of the eschatological element in the Gospel. The *progress* and *phases* of the struggle, there with the Jews, here with the Gentiles, are also exactly similar. In both works the end seems near, even from the beginning. But, nevertheless, it is found to be deferred; we expect it in the Apocalypse after the sixth seal, after the sixth trumpet; nevertheless, it is again postponed, as in the Gospel where John repeats several times the phrase: "But his hour was not yet come." The *denouement*, also, is fundamentally the same, though under two different forms: outward victory of Satan over the kingdom of God: in the Gospel, by the murder of Jesus; in the Apocalypse, by the extermination of the Church under the Antichrist; but in both also, victory, at first spiritual, then soon afterwards external, of the champion of the cause of God; there, through the resurrection of Christ; here, through the glorification of the Church. We see that the two subjects only are different: on one side, the Christ *having come*, on the other, the Christ *coming*. But, nevertheless, the one of the two works seems to be made in imitation of the other, both in relation to the part of the actors and the progress of the action.

There is only one way by which these two works can be successfully placed in contradiction to each other: it is, as Luthardt says, to materialize the Apocalypse unduly, and unduly to spiritualize the Gospel. By this manœuvre the common crowd may be dazzled; but this is no longer science, it is fiction. The two works exist; and, sooner or later, the truth recovers its rights.

If the results of our study are well founded, all the external proofs in favor of the Johannean origin of the Apocalypse, to which Baur, Hilgenfeld and Volkmar attach so high a value, become so many confirmations of the Johannean origin of the Gospel.

XII. There is an objection which seems to have produced on the minds of our French critics, such as Renan and Sabatier, the decisive impression. John is called in the fourth Gospel *the disciple whom Jesus loved:* this is a marked superiority which is ascribed to him as related to his fellow apostles. This is not all; he is constantly exalted in such a way as to become fully the equal of Peter or even to surpass him, not only in agility, but also in intelligence and in readiness of faith. This spirit of jealousy and mean rivalry cannot have been the spirit of John himself: it must be acknowledged that the redaction of our Gospel, at least, is due to a disciple of this apostle, who wished at any cost to exalt the person and the role of the venerated master whose narratives and lessons he had gathered together. We find ourselves here evidently in the presence of a tendency-process. There are facts related; with what purpose are they

related? One answers: because they happened in this way, the other searches after secret intentions and soon discovers them; he attributes the facts to the imagination of the narrator as being moved by some particular view. It is a serious thing to found conclusions, which may have decisive consequences for the Church, on such methods of interpretation. In this particular case, it happens that the supposed intention is in manifest contradiction to a very large number of facts. In chap. i. 43, Peter, it is true, only comes to Jesus as the third one. But if it were to exalt John at the expense of that disciple, the author, who does not trouble himself with the history, should have assigned to John himself the part of the one who introduced Peter to Jesus. This he does not do; he ascribes this honor to Andrew, Peter's *own brother*—by this expression he explains this part played by him, and assigns the cause of it historically. As for John, he is not directly designated in this scene, either by his name or by any paraphrase whatever. Not only this; but in ver. 41, even before Andrew brings Peter, when he is introduced for the first time on the scene, he is already designated as *the brother of Simon Peter*,—of that Peter who has not yet appeared, and who is thus presented, from the beginning, as the principal personage of the whole evangelical history by the side of Jesus. Finally, as if all this were not yet sufficient, in the view of the author, suitably to exalt the person and part of Peter, Jesus, at the first sight, discerns in him His principal auxiliary, and marks him by an honorable name, while he does nothing of the kind with regard to the four or five other disciples who were called at the same time. And yet in this scene it is that the critics are able to discover the intention of disparaging Peter or exalting John! Chap. vi. places us again in the midst of the apostolic circle. Who plays a part in this scene of friendship? It is Philip, it is Andrew, who is again designated as *the brother of Simon Peter* (vv. 5, 8). Then, at the end of the whole narrative, when, in presence of the defection of nearly all the Galilean disciples, one of the apostles begins to speak in reply to the question of Jesus: "Will ye also go away?" who is the one to whom the evangelist gives the post of honor, and who proclaims in the name of all his immovable faith in the Messiahship of Jesus? Is it John? Is it some little known disciple whose rivalry would be little dangerous to this apostle? It is Peter himself, he whom our evangelist wishes to disparage! At the last supper, Peter beckons to John, who is seated next to Jesus, to request him to make inquiry of the Master. But if the thing really happened in this way, what conclusion is to be drawn from it? And who would be able seriously to affirm the opposite? Is there here an impossibility? Does not the following story actually prove, by an insignificant circumstance, that Peter was not at Jesus' side (vv. 5, 6)? Finally, in the same passage, does not the evangelist attribute to Peter an expression in which all his devotion, all his faith, breaks forth; "Not only my feet, Lord, but also my hands and my head!" (xiii. 9). The conversations which follow the supper presented to the evangelist an admirable occasion for placing upon the scene his favorite disciple, the one whom Jesus loved. Questions of

Thomas, of Philip, of Judas are spoken of; but not the least allusion is made to the presence of this disciple. Peter's exclamation of devotion: "I will lay down my life for thy sake," is recalled to mind; can this be a piece of Machiavellism, for the purpose of more strikingly pointing out his presumption and afterwards making more prominent his denial? But as to this fall of Peter, John is precisely the one who relates it in the mildest way. No oath, no curse in Peter's mouth; this simple word—*He said.* Peter is introduced into the High-Priest's house by *another disciple,* who was an acquaintance of that personage; but nothing tells us that this disciple was John. And even if it were John, it would be a scanty honor, in a work whose tendency is said to be so strongly anti-Jewish, to have been in relation with the spiritual head of the nation. In Gethsemane, it is Peter who, in our Gospel, smites with the sword. When judged in relation to the thought of Jesus, this act is a fault, no doubt; but in contrast with the cowardice of the rest of the disciples, all of whom flee, it is assuredly an honor. Peter is not afraid to put into practice the profession of devotion which he had made. On the morning of the resurrection, when the two disciples run to the tomb, John reaches it *most quickly,* and this is said to be one of the deliberate claims on behalf of this apostle of superiority to his colleague. . . . Do the critics dare to write such puerilities! If it is so, let them abstain, at least, from calling such a work, with Hilgenfeld, "the Gospel with an eagle's flight!" Immediately afterwards, from the mere sight of the order which reigns in the sepulchre, John reaches the belief in the resurrection (xx. 8), while it is not said that this was the case with Peter. Here we have what seems a little more suspicious. But precisely here is one of the most decidedly autobiographical features of the fourth Gospel. The question is of the most internal fact, that of faith,—and John simply tells us how this fact was accomplished in himself. Could he tell so exactly what took place in his colleague?—whether the light came into his heart, also, *at that moment* and *in that way?* Perhaps he was always himself ignorant of it. But as Paul and Luke, both of them, speak to us of an appearance of Jesus after He rose, which was granted to Peter on that same day, this circumstance renders it probable that that apostle remained near the tomb with a confused presentiment, which was only transformed into real faith by means of that appearance. Let us remark, in passing, that no special appearance accorded to John is mentioned. There remains the scene of the twenty-first chapter. If the writer truly desired to establish a parallel between the two apostles, it must be acknowledged that the contrast is altogether in favor of Peter. John, it is true, discerns the Lord from the time when they were on the boat; but he does not stir from the place, while Peter immediately leaps into the water. John does not play the least part in the conversation which follows the meal; Peter is the sole object of the Lord's attention. Not only does Jesus reinstate him as an apostle; but He expressly entrusts to him the direction of the Church, and even that of the apostolate: "Feed my lambs! Lead my sheep!" And as the crown of his ministry, He promises him the honor of a bloody

martyrdom. After this, it is he, and he only, whom He invites to follow Him, in order to receive, in a confidential conversation, the communications which He has still to make to him. The disciple whom Jesus loved allows himself, without having been summoned, to walk modestly behind them; it is Peter himself who puts him on the scene, by means of the question which he addresses somewhat indiscreetly to the Lord with regard to him. But, it is said, the superiority of John reappears even here; for the promise which is made to him, *that he should not die*, eclipses even that of martyrdom which had just been made to Peter. Let it be so, if one will; only it must be admitted that the following explanation of the evangelist, in that case, ought not immediately to invalidate the pretended promise! What a contrast between those two expressions, the one relative to John: "Now Jesus did not say, that he should not die;" the other relative to Peter: "Now he said this concerning the death by which Peter should glorify God."

There remains, in reality, only one expression that can be used to the advantage of the objection against which we are contending; it is the designation: *The disciple whom Jesus loved.* Weisse was the first, I believe, who was shocked at this expression, and saw in it a repulsive vainglory. Sabatier thinks that, if John had written it himself, "it would be difficult to place humility among his virtues." How much more delicate tact and more just a judgment does Hase show! He says: "Weisse did not comprehend this joyous pride of being in all humility the object of the most unmerited love." Among all the rays of the glory *full of grace and truth*, which the Word made flesh had displayed here below, there was one which had fallen upon John, and which he must reproduce in his work: the Son of God had carried condescension even to the point of having *a friend.* To recall to mind so sweet a remembrance was not pride: it was humble gratitude. To disguise his own name under this paraphrase was not to glorify the man; it was to exalt the tenderness of Him who had deigned to stoop so low. He knew himself no longer except as the pardoned believer knows himself—as the object of the most marvelous love. It is thus that Paul speaks of himself in 2 Cor. xii. 2–5.

XIII. We have long since expressed the conviction that the position of Reuss with regard to the fourth Gospel is untenable. To admit the apostolic origin of this work, and at the same time to regard the discourses which are contained in it as together forming a treatise of mystical theology, which the author, of his own will, has put into the mouth of Jesus—there is here an evident moral impossibility. Reuss was obliged to seek the means of extricating himself from this contradiction, and he has recently discovered it. It is the passage xix. 35.[1] Following the example of Weisse, Schweizer, Keim, and Weizsäcker, he thinks that he sees in this passage the perfectly clear distinction, established by the author of the Gospel himself, between his own person and that of the Apostle John, who orally furnished him the authentic materials of his narrative. Let us

[1] *Théologie johannique*, p. 103.

study this text more closely. It is composed of three propositions: "And he that hath seen, hath borne witness; and his witness is true; and he knoweth that he saith true, that ye may believe." Until now, it had been thought that it was the *witness* himself who spoke here. 1. He declares that his testimony respecting the fact related (the simultaneous accomplishment of the two prophecies by the thrust of the lance, apparently accidental, of the Roman soldier) is now given (the perfect μεμαρτύρηκε): it is a thing done, done by the story itself; comp. i. 34; 2. He attests the truth of this testimony; 3. He solemnly affirms the deep sense which he bears within himself of the reality of the fact related—and this, to the end that the readers (*you*) may fully believe it.

In this third clause *the author*, in speaking of the witness, uses the pronoun ἐκεῖνος, *that one*, and many find in this word the proof that he speaks of the witness as of a *different* person from himself and one who can be no other than the apostle. But, first, the author may with perfect propriety speak of himself in the third person, as Paul does in 2 Cor. xii. 2–5, or as Jesus Himself does, when He designates Himself habitually under the name *Son of man*, and consequently he may employ the pronoun of the third person in all its forms. The reason why he chooses here the pronoun ἐκεῖνος, *that one*, is because this word has a peculiar and constant signification in the fourth Gospel. It designates, in this book, a being who *exclusively* possesses a certain character, a certain function; consequently, not a person *remote* in contrast with another who is *nearer*, but a *single* person in contrast with *every* other; thus i. 18: "No one hath seen God at any time . . .; the only-begotten Son, *he* it is, (ἐκεῖνος), who hath declared him;" or xii. 48: "My word . . ., *it*, it alone (ἐκεῖνος), shall judge him;" comp. v. 39: "The Scriptures . . ., *they* are they (ἐκεῖνοι) which . . .;" xvi. 14: "The Spirit . . . *he* (ἐκεῖνος) shall glorify me," etc., etc. Jesus, also, in speaking of Himself, designates Himself by this pronoun; comp. ix. 37: "Thou hast seen him (the Son of God) and he that speaketh unto thee is *he* (ἐκεῖνος)."[1] It is exactly the same with xix. 35. He designates Himself by this pronoun as the one who, having been the only witness of the fact among the apostles, can alone attest it with the certainty of an eye-witnessing. There exists, therefore, no well founded logical or grammatical objection against the most generally admitted sense of the passage.

See now the sense which the before-mentioned writers endeavor to give to it.

1st proposition: The *redactor* of the Gospel declares that it is the *witness* (the apostle) who has informed him concerning the circumstance which he has just related. This meaning is not impossible, although we might be surprised to see suddenly appearing here the distinction between these two personages, of which the narrative does not, up to this point, offer the least trace.

2d proposition: The writer attests the truth of the story which he has

[1] Reuss objects that in the passage ix. 37, the pronoun ἐκεῖνος designates the predicate, while, in xix. 35, it refers to the subject of the clause. What matters this? In both cases it is still the same person, who is speaking, who designates himself by this pronoun.

from the lips of the witness. This is unnatural, for it would rather belong to the witness to attest the truth of the fact related by the evangelist. An unknown and anonymous redactor, presenting himself as guarantee for the story of the witness, and of a witness who is an apostle! This would be strange enough. Whence would he derive this right and this authority?

3d proposition: The redactor attests the deep sense which the witness bears within himself of the reality of the fact related. "He knoweth (the apostle-witness) that he saith true." This becomes altogether unintelligible; for how can a man testify of that which takes place in the inner consciousness of another individual? We might understand the redactor's saying, "And *I know* that he saith true." That would mean: Such an one as *I* know him to be,—I have the certainty that he cannot speak falsely. But with the form, "*he knows* (he) that he says true," the declaration has no meaning. Finally, the redactor adds: "to the end that ye may believe." If it is John who says this, to indicate the purpose of the story which he has just committed to writing, we understand what he means: "I, the witness, have the inward consciousness that what I relate to you is true, *to the end that you also* (who read) *may believe* (as well as I who have seen)." His testimony is to become for those who read, what the sight itself has been for him. But if the matter, on the other hand, is of the oral narrative which the apostle gave to the author a long time before, this statement has no longer any meaning; for there is no direct connection between such a testimony and the readers of the present work; the words "to the end that you may believe" have no longer any justification.

Finally, we must notice the two verbs in the present tense: "He *knows*" and "he *says true*." What do they prove? That, at the moment when these lines were written, the witness of the facts was still living. And in that case, what is gained by substituting for him, as a redactor, one of his disciples? The Gospel remains nevertheless, a narrative composed under the eyes and with the approbation of John himself.[1]

There is, moreover, another passage which absolutely condemns this sense given to xix. 35 by Reuss and by many others; it is the analogous declaration of xxi. 24. Here men, in a position which was recognized by the Church and respected, expressly affirm that which these critics deny on the foundation of xix. 35, to wit, the identity of the evangelist-redactor with the apostle witness: "This disciple (the one whom Jesus loved) is he *who testifieth* (ὁ μαρτυρῶν) of these things and *who wrote them* (ὁ γράψας), and we know that his testimony is true." Reuss claims, it is true, that these men fell into an error, and that, a certain time after John's death, they,

[1] Reuss, indeed, understands this serious difficulty and tries to find a way of removing it. He says that, if the author has said: *He knows*, it is because the Greek language did not offer him any special term for saying: *He knew*. But it was sufficient for the author to write instead of οἶδεν *he knows*, ἤδει *he knew* (*he knew* when he was alive); and does not the following verb also, put in the present tense: "*that he saith true*," confute such a puerile evasion?

in good faith, confounded the apostle with the redactor. But these attestors, who had the power to provide the Gospel with a postscript which is not wanting in any manuscript or in any version, must have taken an active part in the publication of the work; they must, consequently, have been the first depositaries of it. Under these conditions, how could an error on their part be possible? Then, in order to their expressing themselves as they do, they must never have read the book which they themselves were publishing, at least the passage xix. 35, since, according to Reuss, the author declares, in the statement there made, precisely the opposite of what they solemnly affirm. Finally, when these two passages are compared, it must not be forgotten that the attestors of chap. xxi. say: *We know*, and not *he knows*, as the one who speaks in chap. xix. says. By the first person plural they distinguish themselves as clearly from the witness-apostle, as by the third person singular, *he knows*, the redactor of xix. 35 identifies himself with this witness. How, then, can Reuss say: "The sentence of xxi. 24 *recurs* in another place in the body of the Gospel; the analogy is patent." Yes, but the difference is none the less patent.[1]

Hilgenfeld has clearly perceived that it is impossible to find in xix. 35 the distinction, intentionally made by the writer, between himself and the witness. He admits, therefore, that the author, after having desired to pass himself off, throughout the whole work, as the Apostle John, forgot himself for a moment in the passage xix. 35, and that he inadvertently drops his disguise. There remains, in fact, only this expedient. But is it admissible? The reader will judge. In any case, if it is so, we must give up speaking of the supreme ability of an author to whom it is believed that such an oversight can be ascribed!

XIV. Will it be necessary to stop at a last objection, to which some critics seem to attach a certain importance? How, it is said, could a man have regarded Jesus as a divine being, after having lived on familiar terms with Him for three years? But this conviction formed itself in him only gradually. And precisely this familiar acquaintance of every day took away from it whatever overpowering element it might have had for dogmatic reflection. The Apocalypse, that work which, in the so-called critical school, is generally ascribed to the apostle, raises exactly the same problem. Jesus is there represented as *the first* and *the last;* He is called *the Holy One* and *the True*, just as Isaiah calls Jehovah; and yet it is ascribed to the apostle. The recognition of the Messianic dignity of Jesus was a first step, which rendered the transition easier to the recognition of His divinity.

Having reached the end of this long review of all the objections raised by modern criticism against the unanimous tradition of the Church, we may be permitted to bring forward a curious phenomenon which is not without psychological importance in the estimate of this discussion. Is it

[1] That we may not prolong this discussion, let us defer until the following section what we have to say respecting the beginning of the first Epistle of John (1 John i. 1–4).

not surprising that every adversary of the authenticity seems to be especially impressed by some one among these fourteen objections, which makes only a feeble impression on the rest of the critics, and in comparison with which he himself attributes to all the others only a slight importance? We leave to the reader the work of explaining this fact, which has more than once given us food for thought.

§ 3. THE INTERNAL EVIDENCE.

In his introduction to the New Testament (§ 93), Credner has summed up this evidence in the following manner: "If we had no historical statement respecting the author of the fourth Gospel, we should, nevertheless, be led to a positive result by the indications which the book itself affords. The nature of the language, the freshness and dramatic vivacity of the narrative, the exactness and precision of the statements, the peculiar manner in which the forerunner and the sons of Zebedee are mentioned, the love, the passionate tenderness, of the author for the person of Jesus, the irresistible charm diffused over the evangelical history as presented from this ideal point of view, the philosophical reflections with which this Gospel begins,—all this leads us to the following result: The author of this work can only be a man born in Palestine, only an eye-witness of the ministry of Jesus, only an apostle, only the beloved apostle; he can only be that John whom Jesus had bound to His own person by the heavenly charm of His teaching, that John who leaned upon His bosom, who stood near the cross, and who, during his residence in a city such as Ephesus was, not only felt himself attracted by philosophical speculation, but even prepared himself to hold his place among these Greeks who were distinguished for their literary culture."

We cannot do better than follow the course traced out in this admirable paragraph, in which we would only desire to change the two terms, *ideal* and *philosophical*, which seem to us not to give the true shade of thought. Taking this summary as a programme, we shall also make our beginning from the circumference, so as gradually to approach towards the centre.

I. The author is a Christian of *Jewish* origin.

This is proved by his style which, without Hebraizing, nevertheless, has the inward peculiarities of the Hebrew language (see p. 135 f.).

This follows also from the corrections which the author makes the translation of the LXX. undergo in accordance with the original Hebrew in a certain number of quotations. We believe, with Westcott[1], that the fact is beyond dispute in the three passages which follow: vi. 45 (Is. liv. 13); xiii. 18 (Ps. xli. 9); xix. 37 (Zech. xii. 10); and we will add, without hesitation, xii. 40 (Is. vi. 10). In no single instance, on the contrary, does the evangelist quote according to the LXX. in disagreement with the Hebrew.

The inner harmony of the teaching of Jesus with the Mosaic Law and the prophets, His constant references to the types of the Jewish history,

[1] *The Holy Bible, St. John*, p. xiv.

the perfect communion of spirit established between Abraham and Jesus,—all these features are brought out so forcibly that we must subscribe to Weizsäcker's judgment: Only a Jew who, in the foreign region where he was living, had preserved *the inheritance of his youth*, could relate his history in this way. The development of the author's personal faith has certainly passed through these two normal phases of Jewish-Christian faith: the recognition of Jesus as the Messiah, and faith in Him as the Son of God. Compare, for the first of these two steps, the profession of faith of the first disciples, i. 42, 46, and for the second, the whole sequel of the narrative. This course of development is again suggested in the expression which sums up the Gospel (xx. 31): "That ye may believe that Jesus is *the Christ, the Son of God.*"

A final and entirely decisive proof appears from the acquaintance which the author shows with Jewish usages. He is perfectly acquainted with the Jewish feasts (the Passover, the Feast of Tabernacles), and not only the greater ones, but also the minor ones, which the law had not instituted,—as the feast of *Purim*, v. 1 (see the Commentary), and that of the *Dedication*, x. 22. He knows of the addition of an eighth day to the Feast of Tabernacles (vii. 37) and the prohibition of all medical treatment on the Sabbath (ix. 14); the Jewish opinions, according to which the coming of the Messiah must be preceded by that of Elijah, and the Messiah must spring from an entirely obscure origin (i. 21; vii. 27). He is not ignorant either of the hostility prevailing between the Jews and the Samaritans, or of the more spiritual character of the Messianic expectation among the latter (iv. 9, 25, 26). The Jewish manner of embalming bodies, different from that of the Egyptians (xix. 40), the custom on the part of the Jews of purifying themselves on entering their dwellings (ii. 6), the synagogal excommunication (ix. 22), the custom of closing the sepulchral caves with great stones (xi. 38; xx. i.), the sale of animals and the money exchange established in the temple (ii. 14),—all these circumstances, several of which are not mentioned in the Synoptics, are familiar to him. He is acquainted with the scruples which the Jews feel, both as to entering into the house of a Gentile, and as to leaving the bodies of condemned persons publicly exposed beyond the very day of execution (xviii. 28; xix. 31). He knows that a Rabbi does not engage in conversation with a woman (iv. 27); that the religious leaders of the nation treat with the most profound disdain the portion of the people who have not received the Rabbinical teaching (vii. 49); and finally, that, in case of a conflict between the law of the Sabbath and that of circumcision on the eighth day, the latter takes precedence of the former (vii. 22, 23).

II. This Jew did not live in a foreign land; he is a *Palestinian* Jew.

He speaks of different places in the Holy Land as a man who is acquainted with them for himself and to whom all the topographical details of that country are familiar. He knows that there are other places of the name of Cana and Bethsaida than those of which he is speaking, and which he marks by the epithet: *of Galilee* (ii. 1; xii. 21). He knows that Bethany is fifteen furlongs from Jerusalem (xi. 18); that Ephraim is situ-

ated on the borders of the desert (xi. 54); that Ænon is near to Salim (iii. 23); that a distance of twenty-five or thirty furlongs is nearly equal to one-half of the breadth of the sea of Tiberias (vi. 19, comp. with Matt. xiv. 24); that the circuit of the northern shore of this sea can be easily made on foot (vi. 5, 22); that in order to go from Cana to Capernaum, one must *go down* (ii. 12); that Cedron must be crossed by a bridge in order to go from Jerusalem to the foot of the Mount of Olives (xviii. 1); that the pool of Siloam is very near to Jerusalem (ix. 7); and that there are intermittent springs in the neighborhood of the temple (v. 7). He also knows the place in the temple where the boxes designed to receive the offerings are found (viii. 20), and Solomon's porch (x. 23). The picture of the entrance to the valley of Sichem, in the scene of Jacob's well, can only have been traced by a man who had looked upon Mount Gerizim towering above the valley, and the magnificent fields of wheat which stretched to the right of the plain of Mukhna. Renan declares: "A Jew of Palestine, who had often passed through the entrance of the valley of Sichem, could alone have written this."

The author is no less well-informed as to the *historical circumstances* of the epoch in which the facts which he describes occur. He knows that the right of putting to death has been recently taken away from the Jews (xviii. 31); he knows that, at the moment when Jesus appears for the first time in the temple, the work of the reconstruction of that edifice has already continued for forty-six years (ii. 20). He is thoroughly acquainted with the relations of family and sympathy which unite the present high-priest with the former high-priest, and the influence which the latter continues to exercise upon the course of affairs (xviii. 13–28).

Baur believed that he had discovered in our Gospel a multitude of historical and geographical errors. This accusation is abandoned at the present day. "There is no reason," says Keim himself, "to believe in these alleged errors" (p. 133). Renan abounds in his expressions of this view: "The too often repeated opinion that our author was neither acquainted with Jerusalem nor with Jewish matters, seems to me altogether destitute of foundation" (p. 522).[1]

III. We can prove by a mass of details that this Palestinian Jew was a *contemporary* of Jesus and a *witness* of His history; let us even add, in order that we may not enter too much into detail and prolong the discussion too far, *an apostle.*

This appears from the mass of minute details, abounding in the narrative, which it is impossible to explain by a dogmatic or a philosophical idea, and which can only be the quite simple and almost involuntary expression of personal recollection.

And, first, with reference to times and occasions: "It was about the tenth hour" (i. 40); "It was about the sixth hour" (iv. 6); "And he abode there two days" (iv. 40); "Yesterday, at the seventh hour" (iv. 52); "It

[1] See, on the alleged mistakes imputed by Baur to the evangelist, this Commentary, at the following passages: i. 28 (*Bethany*); iii. 23 (*Ænon*); iv. 5 (*Sychar*); xviii 1 (*Cedron*); vii. 52; xi. 49, etc.

was winter," or "It was stormy weather" (x. 22); "It was night" (xiii. 30); "In infirmity for thirty-eight years" (v. 5). As to the designation of places: the treasury of the temple (viii. 20); Solomon's porch (x. 23); Jesus stopped outside of the village (xi. 30). As to numbers: the six water-pots in the vestibule (ii. 6); the four soldiers (xix. 23); the hundred pounds of perfume (xix. 39); the two hundred cubits of distance, and the one hundred and fifty-three fishes (xxi. 8, 11). We are introduced by all sorts of details into the inmost circle of Jesus and His disciples. The author recalls the relations full of pleasantness, which Jesus sustained towards them—towards Philip, for example (vi. 5–7); the intervention of Andrew (vv. 8, 9); the small boy having the loaves; the indirect warning given to Judas (ver. 70); the name of the father of this apostle (ver. 71); the rough, but generous declaration of Thomas (xi. 16); his incredulous exclamation and his cry of adoration (xx. 25, 28); the questions of Thomas, Philip, and Judas, on the last evening (chap. xiv.); the decisive moment when the light finally came to them all, and when they proclaimed their faith (xvi. 30); the sudden invitation of Jesus: "Arise, let us go hence" (xiv. 31). Points such as these may also be noticed: "They had kindled a fire of coals . . . " (xviii. 18); "The robe was without seam, woven from the top throughout" (xix. 23); "Having put the sponge around the hyssop-stalk" (xix. 29); "The servant's name was Malchus" (xviii. 10), etc., etc. "So many precise details," says Renan, "which are perfectly understood if one sees in them the recollections of an old man of a wonderful freshness;" but, we will add, which become repulsive, in so serious a narrative, if they are only fictitious details designed to conceal the romance-writer under the mask of the historian. Only a profane charlatan could thus trifle with the person and character of the best-known actors in the evangelical drama, and with the person of the Lord Himself. Weitzel has properly noticed how this delicate narrative initiates us into all the varied shades of the inmost life of the apostolic circle.[1] The author designates the disciples, not according to their names as generally received in the Church—the ones which they bear in the apostolic catalogues, but according to that which they bore among their fellow-disciples; thus, instead of Bartholomew, he says: Nathanael (i. 46–50; xxi. 2), and three times he designates Thomas by the Greek translation *Didymus* (twin), as if it were for him a matter of personal reminiscence, dear to his heart (xi. 16; xx. 24; xxi. 2).

To all these details, let us add the great scenes in which, as if openly, the pencil of the eye-witness shows itself: the story of the calling of the first disciples (chap. i.); of the visit to Samaria (iv.); of the confidential scenes at the resurrection of Lazarus and at the washing of the disciples' feet (xi. and xiii.); and finally, the incomparable picture of the negotiations of Pilate with the Jews (xviii. and xix.).

If, after all these facts, any doubts could remain for us with reference to the author's having the character of an eye-witness, they would fall away

[1] *Studien und Kritiken*, 1849.

before his own testimony, which no one at the present day—neither Weizsäcker nor Reuss and Sabatier,—can bring themselves to charge with imposture, as the school of Baur did.

This testimony is expressed in the three following passages: i. 14; xix. 35, and 1 Ep. i. 1–4.

The author expresses himself thus in i. 14; "And the Word became flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory. . . ." It is at present claimed that the question here is only of the interior sight of faith, which is the appanage of every Christian. Does not Paul say, "We behold the glory of the Lord with unveiled face" (2 Cor. iii. 18); and John himself: "Whosoever sinneth hath not seen him" (1 John iii. 6)? Thus speak Keim and Reuss. There is a spiritual beholding of Jesus, it is true, to which the quoted words refer; but these words are not found, in the epistles from which they are taken, in connection with the representation of the fact of the incarnation, as in the passage John i. 14: "The Word *became* flesh, . . . it *dwelt*, . . . and we *beheld*. . . ." At the beginning of an historical work, which commences thus, and in which the earthly life of Jesus is to be related, such a declaration cannot have any other intention than that of solemnly *legitimizing* the narrative which is to follow. We cannot confound such a context with that of an epistle in which the author describes the spiritual state common to all Christians.

The passage xix. 35 has already been examined. The identity of the author of the Gospel with the apostle who was witness of the crucifixion of Jesus, is there positively affirmed. "This passage," Sabatier objects, "is of too similar a tenor to that of the appendix (xxi. 24), for us not to draw from it the same conclusion." But we have already shown (p. 185) that the tenor of the two passages is, on the contrary, entirely different, in chap. xix: (*he knows*), the witness affirms his identity with the redactor of the Gospel; in chap. xxi.: (*we know*), the friends of the author and witness affirm his identity with the disciple whom Jesus loved; thus each affirms fundamentally the same thing, but in a manner apposite to his particular position and role.[1]

There exists a second work, coming evidently from the same pen as the Gospel, and whose author likewise declares himself a witness of the facts and an apostle, with a clearness which leaves nothing to be desired on the part of any one who does not wish to close his eyes to the light. We read, 1 Ep. of John i. 1 ff.: "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have beheld and our hands have handled of the Word of life, . . . we declare it unto you, that you may have fellowship with us; . . . and we write unto you these things, that your joy may be fulfilled; and this is the message which we have heard from him and declare unto you. . . ." How can we deny, in the face of expressions like these, that the author had the intention of giving himself out as an eye and ear-witness of the facts of the Gospel

[1] The ten lines of Sabatier on this subject (*Encycl. des sc. relig.*, p. 193), are for me an inexplicable enigma and one which cannot be discussed.

history? Let any one tell us what more forcible terms he could have used in order to designate himself as such. Reuss says: "The fact that Jesus lived the life of mortals is enough to enable every believer to say: We have seen, heard, touched Him."[1] Yes, but on the condition that, in speaking thus, he does not place himself in express contrast to other believers who have neither seen nor heard nor touched, and to whom for this reason he says: "*We* declare *unto you*, . . . *we* write *to you* these things, to the end that you may have part in them, and that your joy may be as complete as ours." Reuss says: "Every preacher who hands over the truth to a new generation will constantly be able to express himself in the same way." We leave in his happy quietude the man who can bring himself into tranquillity by such a subterfuge. There is evidently here the same contrast as in John xx. 29, between those who *have seen* and those who must *believe without having seen*, or, as in xix. 35, between the one who *has seen* and *you* who are to *believe*. Sabatier has recourse to another expedient. He thinks he can explain these words by the author's desire, "not to give an historical testimony, but to combat Docetism." There is nothing more in these words therefore, he says, than "the positive affirmation of the reality of the flesh of Jesus Christ" (p. 193). But, if it were so, to what purpose the commencing with these words: That which was *from the beginning*, which are developed in the second verse by the following: "And *the life which was with the Father* was manifested, and we have seen it, and we bear witness of it?" We see that the thought of the author is not to contrast the reality of Jesus' body with the idea of a mere appearance, but to bring out these two facts which seemed contradictory, and the union of which was of vital importance to his view: on one side, the *divine*, eternal being of Christ; on the other, the perfect reality, not of His body only, but of His *human* existence. It is the same thought as that which is formulated in the expression which is the theme of the Gospel: "The Word was made flesh." Moreover, the Docetae did not deny the sensible appearances in the life of the Lord, and the apostle would not have accomplished anything in opposition to them by affirming these.

It remains incontrovertible, therefore, for every one who is determined to take the texts for what they are, and not to make them say what he wishes, that the author expressly gives himself out in two of these texts, and that he is given out in the third by his friends who know him personally, as the witness of the facts related in this book; and if one refuses to admit this double testimony, one cannot escape the necessity of making him an impostor. We are thankful to the modern writers who, like Reuss and Sabatier, shrink from such a consequence; but we believe that it is impossible to do so except by sacrificing the exegetical conscience.

IV. If we endeavor, finally, to designate this apostle, at once the witness and redactor of the evangelical facts, we are forced to recognize in him the disciple whom Jesus loved, John himself.

[1] *Théol. johan.*, p. 106.

And first: *The disciple whom Jesus loved.*

The author declares himself, xix. 35, to be the one who saw with his own eyes two prophecies fulfilled at the same time by the thrust of the heathen soldier's spear. Now, his narrative mentions only one apostle as present at the crucifixion of the Lord—the one whom Jesus loved (ver. 26). It is evident, therefore, that he gives himself out as that disciple. We have already noticed the description of the way in which the disciple whom Jesus loved reached the belief in the resurrection (xx. 8, 9). The absolutely autobiographical character of this story leaves no doubt as to the identity of this disciple with the author. The same is the case with the confidential and entirely personal details which are given respecting the relation of Peter to him at the last supper (xiii. 24–27), and of the story of his last conversation with Jesus following upon His appearance in Galilee (xxi. 19–22). Let us add that no one ought to have been more anxious than the disciple whom Jesus loved to set right the meaning of a saying which concerned him, and which was circulating in a form that was compromising to the dignity of Jesus.

We say further: *John, the son of Zebedee.*

In all the apostolic catalogues, John and James are named in the first place after Simon Peter, and this rank which is constantly assigned to them is justified by the peculiar distinctions which they shared with that apostle. How does it happen that in the fourth Gospel, in the single case in which the sons of Zebedee are mentioned (xxi. 2), they are placed last among the five apostles who are named, and thus after Thomas and Nathanael? This circumstance can be explained only if the author of this narrative is precisely one of these two brothers. In the Synoptics, the forerunner of Jesus is constantly called: John *the Baptist;* this was the title which had been conferred upon him not only by the Christian, but also by the Jewish tradition, as we see from Josephus (*Antiq.* xviii. 5. 2.): "John, *surnamed Baptist*, whom Herod had killed." In our Gospel, on the contrary, he is always called simply John. It must naturally be inferred from this fact, that the author of this narrative had learned to know the forerunner before fame had added to his name, as an inseparable epithet, the title of Baptist, consequently from the beginning of his public activity. Then, if we have reasons for holding that the author himself bore the name of John, we can the more easily understand how he did not feel the need of giving to the forerunner a title suited to distinguish him from some other John, not less known in the Church. For the idea of a confusion between him and the one who had the same name with him must have been, as Hase says, "entirely remote from his consciousness." Finally, there remains a decisive circumstance: it is the absence from the narrative of any mention both of the name of John himself, and of the names of the other members of his family. His mother, Salome, who is mentioned in the Synoptics among the women present at the crucifixion of Jesus (Matt. xxvii. 56; Mark xvi. 1) is not named here in the parallel enumeration (John xix. 25). No more is James mentioned in the scene of the calling of the first disciples (chap. i.), where, however, a slight touch full of delicacy betrays his

presence.[1] This way of proceeding is absolutely different from that of forgers. "The latter," says Reuss, "make it their study to lay emphasis upon the names which are to serve them as a passport."[2] This complete and consistent omission, from one end of the work to the other, of the names of three personages who occupied one of the first places in the company that surrounded Jesus, does not permit us to doubt that the author was in a peculiar relation to all the three.

We cannot deny ourselves the pleasure of quoting here, in closing, a beautiful paragraph from Hase (p. 48): "While the Apostle John is nowhere named, there passes across the entire Gospel an unknown and, as it were, veiled figure, which sometimes comes forth, but without the veil ever being raised. We cannot believe that the author did not himself know who this disciple *whom Jesus loved* was, who at the last supper rested on His bosom, who with Peter followed his Master when made a prisoner, to whom his Master left His mother as a charge, and who, running with Peter, came first to the tomb. There must have existed, therefore, a peculiar relation between the author and this personage, and a reason, personal to himself, for his not naming him. Why is it not natural to think that he is himself designated by this circumlocution which included in itself the sublimest contents and the whole happiness of his existence?"

§ 4. THE CONTRARY HYPOTHESES.

We shall occupy ourselves here only with the hypotheses which have a serious character. We set aside, therefore, without discussion, fancies such as those of Tobler and Lützelberger, who ascribe our Gospel, the former to Apollos, and the latter to a Samaritan emigrant at Edessa in Mesopotamia, about 135. We meet, in the first place, "*the great unknown*" of Baur and his school, who is said to have written, a little before or after the middle of the second century, the romance of the Logos; the man whom Keim calls "the most brilliant flower which followed the age of the apostles." One thing strikes us, at the first glance, in this hypothesis: it is precisely this title of unknown which the critics are obliged to give to the author of such a work. Every one knows the mediocrity of the personages and writers of the second century, as compared with those of the first. To the epoch of creative production that of tame reproduction had succeeded. What is that Epistle of Clement of Rome, to which Eusebius adjudges the epithets *great and wonderful* (ἐπιστολὴ μεγάλη τε καὶ θαυμασία)? A good, pious letter, such as an ordinary Christian of our day would write. Polycarp and Papias are in no way superior to Clement. Ignatius surpasses them in originality; but what strangeness and what eccentricity! Hermas is of the most oppressive dullness. The Epistle to Diognetus shows a certain superiority in a literary point of view; but as to the thoughts, and even as to what it has of a striking character in the expo-

[1] Chap. i. 42: "Andrew *first* finds *his own* brother Simon." This strange form is only explicable by the understood idea that the other disciple, also himself, sought his brother, but found him only at a later moment.

[2] *Théol. johannique*, p. 100.

sition of them, it rests absolutely on the epistles of Paul and the fourth Gospel. If what is borrowed from these writings is taken away from it, it falls back into the general mediocrity. And yet in the midst of this period of feebleness there rises a unique man, whose writings have so original a character that they form a class wholly by itself in the entire body of Christian and human literature; this man does not live as a hermit; he takes, according to Baur, an active part in the conflicts of his time; he pronounces the word of pacification respecting all the questions which disturb it; in an incomparable work, he lays the foundation of the Christianity and of the wisdom of future ages,—and this man, this "flower of his age" no one has seen blooming; the Church, the witness of his life and work, has forgotten even the trace of his existence. No one can tell where this extraordinary star rose and set. In very truth, a strange history! The critics say, it is true: "Are not also the author of the book of Job, and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews "great unknown" persons? We answer: The remote antiquity from which the first of these works comes, remains for us buried in profound darkness; what a difference from that second century of the Church, respecting which we possess so many and so detailed points of information! The Epistle to the Hebrews is only a simple theological treatise, an important and original writing, no doubt; but what a difference as compared with a work containing a history, in many respects new, of Jesus, that chief of all subjects to the view of the Church! The author of the one is lost in the splendors of the apostolic period; while the author of the other ought to shine as a star of the first magnitude in the badly-lighted sky of the second century.

Let us add that at that epoch, when the image of Jesus was fixed by means of three universally disseminated narratives which were already distinguished from every other writing of the same kind, a pseudo-John would have carefully guarded himself against compromising the success of his fraud, by deviating from the generally received history of Jesus. Renan rightly says: "A forger, writing about the year 120 or 130 [how much more in the period from 130–160!] a gospel of imagination, would have contented himself with treating the received story after his own fancy, as the apocryphal gospels do, and would not have overturned from the foundation what were regarded as the essential lines of Jesus' life."[1] Or, as Weizsäcker also observes, "He who could have written this Gospel in order to introduce into the Church certain ideas, would never have ventured to invent an historical basis so different from that which the prevailing traditions presented."[2] The author who, with a sovereign and magisterial authority, has modified, rectified, completed the Synoptical narration, cannot have been a mere unknown person; he must have felt

[1] *Vie de Jésus*, 13th ed., pp. lxxv.-lxxvi.

[2] *Jahrb. für deutsche Theologie*, 1859, p. 698.—Reuss says, in the same line: "Is it to be believed that a forger, if he had desired to pass for one of the first disciples, would have dared to deviate so many times from the Synoptical narratives with respect to generally known facts, at the risk of immediately seeing his own charged with errors and falsehoods?" The fact here indicated is so manifest that de Wette himself was already struck by it: "A definitive critical judgment which

himself to be *recognized* as a master on this ground, and assured of finding credence for his narrative in the bosom of the Church.

Hase also justly calls attention to the point, that a writer removed from the facts and desirous of offering to the men of his time a picture of the person of the Logos, would not have failed, in this fictitious image, to reduce the human element to a minimum and to trace the absolutely marvelous history of a God, according to him only a mere earthly *form;* while the fourth Gospel presents to us precisely the opposite phenomenon: "Everywhere in Jesus the most complete and tender humanity; everywhere, under the golden breastplate of the Logos, the beating of the heart of a true man, whether in joy or in grief."[1]

Hilgenfeld thinks that the unknown author, in composing such a work, wished to bring back the churches of Asia from the Judaizing Christianity of the Apostle John to the pure spiritualism of St. Paul, which was originally established in those churches. Ordinarily, the course of forgers is justified by saying, that they make the alleged author speak as they think that he would have spoken in the circumstances in which they are themselves living. It is in this way that Keim also excuses the pseudo-John: "Our author has written in the just conviction that John would have written precisely so, if he were still living at his time." Let our two critics put themselves in accord, if they can! According to the second, the author aims at continuing the Johannean work in Asia; according to the first, he labors to overthrow it, and that by borrowing the mask of John himself! This second degree of pious fraud draws very near to impious fraud.

The expedient of pious fraud has been singularly abused in these last times, as if this device had been allowed without reluctance by the conscience of the Church itself. That it was frequently made use of, the facts indisputably prove; but that the Church ever gave its assent to it, the facts quite as positively deny. It was in vain for the author of the well-known book: *The Acts of Paul and Thecla*, to allege that he had composed that little story with a good intention and out of love for the Apostle Paul (*id se amore Pauli fecisse*); he was nevertheless obliged, after having confessed his faults, to give up his office of presbyter (*convictum atque confessum loco decessisse*). Here is what took place, according to the report of Tertullian, in a church of Asia Minor, in the second century.[2] And yet the question in the case of that writing was only of a harmless anecdote of which Paul was the hero, while, in the case of the fourth Gospel, the romance would be nothing less than a fictitious history of the person of the Lord!

This mysterious X of the Tübingen criticism is in truth only an *imag-*

denies to John any participation in this work, has against it not only the odiousness of the supposition of a forger, but also the improbability that Christian antiquity would have accepted a Gospel which deviated from the evangelical tradition respecting points which were so important, without feeling itself assured and quieted by its apostolic authority." —*Einl.*, § 110 g.

[1] *Gesch. Jesu*, p. 47.

[2] Tertullian, *de baptismo*.

inary quantity. As soon as we place ourselves in the presence of the world of realities, we understand that this great unknown is no other than a great *unrecognized* one, John himself.

It was necessary, therefore, to make trial of a name. Nicolas has proposed *the presbyter John*, and it is for this personage that Renan seems disposed, at present, to decide.[1] But this hypothesis raises difficulties of no less magnitude than the preceding one. First of all, it cannot be supposed that such a man, an immediate disciple of Jesus and contemporary of John, would have tried to make himself pass for that apostle, by expressing himself as he makes the author do in the passage xix. 35. Moreover, with what other intention than that of disguising himself, could he have effaced so carefully from his narrative the names of this apostle, of his brother and his mother? Can such a role be attributed to the aged disciple of the Lord? Finally, this pious presbyter can only have been a man of the second rank. Papias, in the enumeration of his authorities, assigns to him the last place, even after Aristion. Polycrates, in his letter to Victor, in which he recalls to mind all the eminent men who had made the Church of Asia illustrious, the apostles Philip and John, Polycarp of Smyrna, Thrasias of Eumenia, Sagaris of Laodicea, Melito of Sardis, makes no mention of this personage. "We must therefore," says Sabatier rightly (p. 195), "leave him in the shade and in the secondary rank where the documents set him before us. He is of no assistance for the solution of the Johannean question."

And what do Reuss, Sabatier, Weizsäcker and others do? They take refuge in a sort of chiaroscuro. Not being able to deny the exactness, the precision, the historical superiority of the information on which our Gospel rests, and, on the other side, being thoroughly determined not to acknowledge the authenticity of the discourses of Jesus, they revert to an anonymous author, and are satisfied with finding in him one of the members of the school of Ephesus, a *disciple of the apostle*, who has mingled the tradition emanating from him with Alexandrian wisdom. But can this demi-authenticity suffice? Is it not, first of all, contrary to the testimony of the author himself, who, as we have seen, declares himself, in his epistle, a personal witness of the facts, and, in the Gospel, a witness of the facts, and the disciple whom Jesus loved? Is it not contrary, furthermore, to the testimony of his colleagues, the other members of the same school, who attest with one accord, xxi. 24, that the witness redactor is no other than the disciple whom Jesus loved? The more we find ourselves forced to carry back the composition of this work even to the epoch of John himself, the more are we obliged to acknowledge the improbability of the supposition of a fraud. It must have been concerted and executed, not by an individual only, but by the whole community who surrounded John. This supposition, which has so little probability, is, moreover, irreconcilable with the admirable originality of the discourses of Jesus. In fact: either these discourses are the work of

[1] *L'Eglise chrétienne*, 1879.

the Apostle John, and, in that case, there is no longer any reason to contest the Johannean composition of all the rest of the work; or they are the work of an anonymous disciple of this apostle, and, in that case, it is necessary to apply here what Sabatier says with reference to the hypothesis of the presbyter John: that "the disciple remains infinitely greater than he who served him as a patron." And how can we apply with any probability to an Ephesian disciple of John all that multitude of details by which we have proved the *Jewish* origin, the *Palestinian* home, the characteristics of *contemporary* and *witness*, of the author of this Gospel narration. The master might indeed have handed over to a *disciple-redactor* the great lines of the narrative; but that multitude of particular and minute details which distinguish this representation from one end to the other, can only be explained if the redactor and the witness are one and the same person.

We conclude by saying, with B. Weiss, that every hypothesis which is opposed to the authenticity strikes against even greater difficulties than the traditional opinion. Keim proudly says: "Our age has set aside the judgment of the ages." But is the school of Baur "our age"? And were it so, no age is infallible. There is quite enough of one proclaimed infallibility in our days, without adding also one of the left to that of the right.

CHAPTER THIRD.

THE PLACE OF COMPOSITION.

If John is indeed the author of the Gospel, and if this apostle fulfilled the second part of his apostleship in Asia Minor, nothing is more probable than the fact of the composition of this Gospel at Ephesus. This is the unanimous tradition of the primitive Church (see pp. 38 ff.); and that region is certainly the one in which we can most easily picture to ourselves the rise of such a work. A mass of details prevent us from thinking that it was composed for Palestinian readers. To what purpose to translate for the ancient Jews Hebrew terms, such as *Rabbi*, *Messiah*, and *Siloam*, to mark the term *Bethesda* as a Hebrew name, and to explain Jewish usages (i. 39, 42; iv. 25; v. 2; ix. 7; ii. 6; xix. 40, etc.)? Other points naturally direct our thoughts towards a Greek country: first, the language; then the complacency with which the author points out certain facts in the ministry of Jesus which have reference to the Greeks, as that ironical question of the Jews: "Will he go to those who are dispersed among the Greeks?" (vii. 35), or the request of the Greeks who, shortly before the Passion, desired to converse with Jesus (xii. 20). It is in an Hellenic sphere that these recollections would have their complete appropriateness. But there were Greek churches elsewhere than in Asia Minor; so some scholars have thought of different countries: Wittichen, of Syria; Baur, of Egypt. Very well! even independently of the tradition, we think that there would still be cause for making our choice in

favor of Asia Minor. This country, says Renan, "was at that time the theatre of a strange movement of syncretic philosophy; all the germs of Gnosticism existed there already." We easily understand from this fact the use of the term Logos, which alludes to the discussions which were probably raised in such a theological and religious centre. Is it not, moreover, in this country that the influence of the Johannean Gospel makes itself quite peculiarly felt during the whole course of the second century? And is not the heresy against which the first Epistle of John seems especially to be directed that of Cerinthus, who taught at Ephesus in the latest period of the apostle's life? Let us add, that it is to the churches of Asia Minor that the epistles of St. Paul are addressed, which treat the subject of the person of Christ from precisely the same point of view as the fourth Gospel; we mean the Epistles to the Colossians and the Ephesians. It was in these regions, no doubt, that human speculations tended to lower the dignity of Christ, and that the churches had the most need of being enlightened on this subject. These indications seem to us sufficient, and even decisive.

CHAPTER FOURTH.

THE OCCASION AND AIM OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

THE tradition is not as unanimous on this point, as on the preceding ones. The statements of the Fathers agree undoubtedly in declaring that, if John determined to write, it was solely at the instance of those who surrounded him. In the Muratorian Fragment, it is said that "John was exhorted to write by his fellow disciples and by the bishops." Clement of Alexandria, states that he did it "at the instigation of the leading men and under the inspiration of the Spirit."[1] Eusebius expresses himself thus: "The apostle, being urged, it is said, by his friends, wrote the things which the first evangelists had omitted."[2] Finally, Jerome, in his emphatic style, declares that "he was constrained by almost the whole body of the bishops of Asia, and by deputations from numerous churches, to write something more profound respecting the divinity of the Saviour and to soar upwards even to the Word of God."[3] This circumstance, attested in so many ways, is interesting in that it accords with what we know of the essentially receptive character, and the absence of outward initiative, which distinguished the Apostle John. But the foreign impulse which induced him to take up his pen must itself have been called forth by some external circumstance; and the following is that which naturally presents itself to the mind. John had for a long period taught by the living voice in those churches. When the Synoptics reached those regions, his hearers noticed and appreciated the differences which distinguished

[1] Προτραπέντα ὑπὸ τῶν γνωρίμων, πνεύματι θεοφορηθέντα (Eus. *H. E.* vi. 14).

[2] *H. E.* iii. 24.

[3] *Comment. in Matth.* iv. *De vir. illustr.* c. 9.

the accounts given by their apostle from these other narrations; and it was the impression produced by this discovery which, no doubt, occasioned the solicitations that were thereafter addressed to him. This explanation is confirmed by the testimony of Clement. "John, the last, seeing that the external things (*corporeal*) had been described in the Gospels (the Synoptics), at the instigation of the leading men . . . composed a *spiritual* Gospel." Eusebius also says that "when Matthew, Mark and Luke had each published his Gospel, these writings having come into the hands of all, and into John's hands, he approved them, . . . and that, being urged by his friends, he wrote . . ." (see above). These friends of John, who had induced him to write, were undoubtedly the depositaries of his book and those who took charge of its publication; and it was they also who, in acquitting themselves of this duty, furnished it with the postscript which has accompanied it throughout the whole world and has reached even to us (xxi. 24).

But what *aim* did the apostle especially propose to himself in acceding to this desire? Here the ancient and modern writers differ. The author of the Muratorian Fragment does not seem to admit any other intention in the evangelist than that of instructing and edifying the Church. John had, according to him, the office of *relating;* the other apostles present (Philip, Andrew?) that of *criticising.* These expressions imply a purely *historical* and *practical* aim.

If, however, the Synoptical Gospels were already in the hands both of the author and of the readers, it is impossible that the new narrative should not have been designed to *complete,* or in certain respects to correct the earlier narratives. Else, to what purpose draw up a new one? So several of the Fathers do not hesitate to set forth this second aim, which is closely connected with the first. Eusebius declares that the apostle wrote the things which were omitted by the first evangelists, and, quite specially, that he supplied the omission of that which Jesus had done at the beginning of His ministry; then he adds that "if Matthew and Luke have preserved for us the *genealogy* of Jesus according to the flesh (*γενεαλογία*), John has taken as his starting-point His divinity (*θεολογία*)." "This," he adds, "was the part which the Divine Spirit had reserved for him as the most excellent of all" (iii. 24). Clement of Alexandria gives a very elevated and altogether spiritual import to John's intention of completing the Synoptics: "As the corporeal things were described in the Gospels, he was solicited to write a spiritual Gospel," that is to say, a Gospel fitted to set forth, by means of the discourses of Jesus preserved in this narrative, the *spirit* of the facts which are related by the Synoptics.

To this *historico-didactic* aim some Fathers add the intention to combat different errors which were beginning to come to light at the close of the first century. This *polemical* aim Irenæus attributes, if not to the whole Gospel as is frequently said, at least to the prologue: "John, the Lord's disciple, wishing to root out the seed which was scattered abroad in the hearts of men by Cerinthus, and already before him by the Nicolaitans . . . , and to lay down in the Church the rule of truth, began thus" (iii.

11, 1). Jerome expresses himself almost in the same way: "As John was in Asia and the seed of the heretics, such as Cerinthus, Ebion and others who deny that Christ has come in the flesh, was already multiplying . . . , he replied to his brethren who solicited him, that he would write if all fasted and prayed to God with him, which was done. After which, the revelation by which he was filled broke forth in this prologue: In the beginning was the Word." (*Ibid.*) Some modern writers have laid hold upon these suppositions, or have added new ones to them. Erasmus, Grotius and Hengstenberg adhere to the idea of a polemic against *Cerinthus.* Lessing, de Wette and others think, with Jerome, that it is especially the Ebionites whom the author had in mind. Semler, Schneckenburger and Ebrard believe that he had the Docetae in view; Grotius, Storr and Ewald; *the disciples of John the Baptist.*

Finally, the modern school, rejecting with a sort of disdain the different aims which we have just indicated, and thinking to rise to a higher conception of our Gospel, ascribe to it a purely *speculative* aim.[1] Lessing had already declared that John had saved Christianity—which would, without him, have disappeared as a Jewish sect—by teaching a loftier conception of the person of Christ.[2] Whence had he drawn this new notion of the Christ? Lessing did not enter into an explanation as to this point, through prudence no doubt. Modern criticism has undertaken to give the explanation in his place. Lücke thinks that John proposed to himself to raise the simple faith of the Church, threatened by the double heresy of Ebionitism and Gnosticism, to the state of *Gnosis*, of higher knowledge. Reuss attributes to the author of this work no other aim than that of publishing his own "evangelical theology founded on the idea of the divinity of the Saviour" (p. 29). Hilgenfeld, as we have seen, maintains that pseudo-John wrote in order to raise again in Asia Minor the standard of Paulinism, which had been overthrown and supplanted by the Judaic-Christianity of John. According to Baur, everything is fictitious, except some Synoptical materials, in this work which was designed to solve all the burning questions of the second century, apparently without touching them. The author brings Gnosis into credit in the Church by introducing the theory of the Logos into it; he moderates the Montanist exaltation; he resolves the question of the Passover at the expense of the churches of Asia, but in a way favorable to the other churches; he reconciles the two parties—the Pauline and the Judaic-Christian; and finally succeeds in founding the one and universal Church after which Christianity aspired from its origin; he consummates the apostolic work.

Our task is to examine these various conceptions and to discern the portion of truth or of error which each one of them may contain.

Our Gospels propose to themselves—all four of them—a single aim, that of giving rise to faith and strengthening it, by presenting to it historically its supreme object, Jesus Christ. But each one does this in its own

[1] Keim: "The evangelist is truly much too great to pursue the historical aim."

[2] *Neue Hypothese über die vier Evangelisten,* Lachmann's ed., vol. xi.

way,—that is to say, each one presents this object to the Church under a different aspect. Matthew *demonstrates*, with a view to the Jews and by means of the agreement between the history and the prophecies. Luke *expounds*, by setting forth for the Gentiles the treasures of the universal divine grace. Mark *depicts*, by making the Wonderful One live again as the witnesses beheld Him. If John relates, it is no more than in the other cases, merely for the purpose of relating. Altogether like the others, he relates for the sake of strengthening the faith of the Church, first in the Messiahship, then in the divinity of Jesus. This is what he declares in the often-quoted passage xx. 30, 31, where he himself gives an explanation respecting the aim of his book: to show in Jesus the Messiah (*the Christ*) first, and then *the Son of God*, to the end that every one may find in Him eternal life.

This declaration indicates nothing else than that *historical* and *practical* aim, which the author of the Muratorian Fragment implicitly ascribes to our Gospel; and its contents are fully confirmed by the contents of the book itself. How, indeed, does the author set about this? He relates the history of the development of his own faith and that of the other apostles, from the day when the two disciples of John the Baptist recognized in Jesus *the Christ* (chap. i.), even to the day when Thomas worshiped Him as his Lord and *his God* (chap. xx.). Here are the starting-point and the goal. The narrative included between these two limits only leads from the one to the other; and this fact alone is sufficient to enlighten us with respect to its aim. John wishes to present anew for his readers the path which his own faith had gone over in the company of Jesus; he wishes by the entire series of facts and teachings which have enlightened himself, to enlighten the Church; he wishes to glorify in its view the divine object of faith by the same means by which Jesus was glorified to his own view: by beholding and hearing the Word made flesh. In expressing ourselves thus, we do nothing but paraphrase the words of John himself at the beginning of his first epistle (i. 1–4), and comment upon that expression: *in presence of his disciples*, in the passage of the Gospel where he explains himself respecting his aim (xx. 30).

But by reason of the very fact that the history traced by him was already set forth in three works which he possessed and which his readers possessed, he inevitably places himself in connection with those earlier narratives. And herein is the reason why he gives up relating the totality of the facts, as if his redaction were the first or the only one. In the declaration xx. 30, 31, he expressly reminds us of the fact that "Jesus did many other things in the presence of His disciples which are not written in this book." It is natural also, as a consequence, that where he finds in those narratives gaps which seem to him of some importance, he should seek to supply them, or that, if some facts do not seem to him to be presented in a full light, he should endeavor to make the true rays fall upon them. As we have said, John certainly did not write *for the purpose of completing*, but he often completed or corrected, in passing, and without *losing* sight of his aim: to display the earthly glory of the Son of God to

the view of faith. It is thus that he omits the Galilean ministry, abundantly described by his predecessors, and devotes himself particularly to the visits to Jerusalem, where the glory of the Lord had shone forth in an indelible manner for his heart, in the struggle with the power of darkness concentrated in that place. This intention of completing the earlier narratives, whether from an historical point of view, as Eusebius thought, or in a more spiritual relation, as Clement of Alexandria declared, is therefore perfectly well-founded in fact; we mention it as a secondary aim and, to express it in a better way, as a means subservient to the principal aim. Reuss thinks that this combination of certain secondary aims with the principal one "only betrays the weakness of these hypotheses." But is there in existence a single historical work, which really pursues only one end, and which does not allow itself, occasionally, to work towards some secondary result? Thiers, surely, did not write the history of the Consulate and the Empire with the purpose of completing earlier narratives. But will he refuse, when occasion calls, to notice particularly the facts which his predecessors may have omitted, or to correct those which, according to him, have been presented inexactly or incompletely? It is not, then, as "slaves of the most vulgar patristic tradition" that we maintain, as Reuss says, "so sorry a thesis."[1] It is because of the facts, the undeniable facts, respecting which Reuss himself, in his last work, has found himself at length compelled to open his eyes,[2] that we continue to maintain this view.

We persist even in a third opinion, no less opposed to the view of this critic. We maintain the truth, within certain limits, of the *polemic* aim attributed to our Gospel by several Fathers, and by a considerable number of modern scholars. The first epistle of John incontrovertibly proves that the author of our Gospel lived in a region in which many false doctrines had already arisen in the bosom of the Church. We are perfectly in accord with Keim and many others in recognizing that the principal heresy combated in this epistle was that of *Cerinthus*, known by the Fathers as the adversary of John at Ephesus. He taught that the true Christ, the Son of God, was not that poor Jew, the son of Joseph, called Jesus, who had died on the cross, but a celestial being who descended upon Him at His Baptism, who took Him temporarily as an organ, but who left Him to return to heaven before the Passion. Nothing gives a better account, than this teaching, of the polemic of 1 John ii. 22: "Who is a liar, but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ?" Comp. also iv. 1–3. Now, can it be denied that the central word of our Gospel: "The Word became flesh" cuts short this error by affirming, together with the fact of the incarnation, the organic and permanent union of divinity and humanity in the person of Jesus Christ? This same expression set aside, on the one hand, the ordinary heresy of the *Ebionites*, who, without falling into the subtleties of Cerinthus, simply denied the divinity of Christ, and, on the other, the *Gnostic* error, perhaps existing already in some, of

[1] *Hist. de la théol. chrétienne*, II. p. 312.

[2] See the note quoted, p. 75.

a divine Christ who had assumed nothing of humanity but the appearance. John thus placed a rock in the midst of the Church against which the waves of the most opposite false doctrines would have to break. This was an indirect polemic, the only one which was in harmony with an historical work, but one to which the more direct polemic of the epistle gave completeness and precise definition.

This epistle of John also does not allow us to deny, in certain passages of the Gospel, the intention to repel the claims of the disciples of John the Baptist, who from the first were ranked among the adversaries of the Lord. Where the apostle says, 1 Ep. v. 6: "This is He that came by water and blood, *even* Jesus Christ; not by water only, but by water and blood," is it not beyond dispute that he means to set aside the pretended Messiahship of John the Baptist, whom his disciples announced as the Christ, though he had offered to the world only the symbolic purification of the baptism of water, and not the real purification through the expiatory blood? If from this evidently polemical passage we come back to the declarations of the Gospel: "He [John] was not the light; but he came to bear witness to the light" (i. 8); "Who art thou?" "And he confessed and denied not, but confessed: I am not the Christ" (i. 19, 20); "And his disciples came to him and said unto him: Behold, He to whom thou hast borne witness, He baptizeth! . . . John answered: Ye are my witnesses that I said unto you: I am not the Christ" (iii. 26–28),—it will be necessary for us, nevertheless, to yield to the evidence and acknowledge that John had in view in these words and these stories early disciples of the forerunner who, impelled by jealous hatred of Christ and of the Gospel, went so far as to pronounce their old master to be the Messiah.[1]

The polemic aim, as a secondary aim, seems to us, therefore, to be justified by the facts. And what, indeed, could be more natural? When we establish a truth, especially a truth of the first importance, we establish it for itself, surely, and in consideration of its intrinsic importance; but not without desiring to set aside, at the same time, the errors which might supplant it or paralyze its beneficent effects.

There is but one aim, among those which have been pointed out, which we find ourselves forced to exclude absolutely; it is—we repeat it to the great offence of Reuss—the *speculative* aim, the only one which this critic allows. Let us explain. In the opinion of Reuss and many others, the fourth Gospel is intended to cause a new theory to prevail in the Church respecting the person of Jesus, which the author had personally formed through identifying Christ with the divine Logos, with which he had become acquainted through the teaching of the Alexandrian philosophy. We have shown that the facts, when seriously inquired into, are not in

[1] Apollos (Acts xviii.) and the twelve disciples of John (Acts xix.) did not go as far as this, surely. But it is not only the fact related in John iii. 25 ff., which shows us the secret hatred of a part of John's disciples, towards Jesus; there are also facts reported by the Synoptics; comp. Matt. ix. 14 and the parallels, and perhaps even xi. 2 ff., since the disciples must, by their statements, have called forth that procedure on John's part.

accord with this view, which, moreover, contradicts the author's own declaration (xx. 30, 31). For in that passage he does not speak of his intention to elevate faith to the condition of speculative knowledge, but simply of his desire to strengthen faith itself by presenting to it its object, Jesus the Messiah and Son of God, in His fullness and conformably to all the signs by which He had caused His matchless glory to shine forth in His own presence and in that of His disciples. There is no place in such a programme for a Christ who is only the fruit of the metaphysical speculations of the evangelist. Moreover, faith is never, in our Gospel, anything else than the assimilation of the testimony (i. 7); and the testimony relates to an historical fact, not to an idea. We may easily picture to ourselves Thiers writing the history of Napoleon with the design of displaying the greatness of his hero; we may also picture him to ourselves as occasionally completing and correcting the narratives preceding his own, or as indirectly justifying the political and financial measures of the great Monarch, by alluding to false theories which were spread abroad respecting these questions. But what the historian certainly would never have done, would be to make use of the person of his hero as a mouthpiece for disseminating in the world any theory whatever which pertained to himself, and to attribute to him with this aim acts which he had not performed or discourses which he had never spoken.[1]

To the end of confirming the theological and speculative aim attributed by him to our Gospel, Reuss asks "if this is not the book which served as the foundation and starting point for the formulas of Nicæa and Chalcedon" (p. 33). I answer: No; for the subject of those formulas was not the texts of John. It was the fact itself of the incarnation, of the union of the divine and human in the person of Christ, respecting the mode of which an understanding was sought for. Now, this fact is not taught only in the fourth Gospel. It is taught, as we have seen, in the Epistles of St. Paul (Col. i., Phil. ii., 1 Cor. viii. and x., etc.), in the Epistle to the Hebrews (chaps. i. and ii.), in the Apocalypse, in the Synoptics themselves. The Johannean Gospel has discovered the expression which best sets forth the union of the divine and human in Christ; but that union itself forms the basis of all the writings of the New Testament. It was not, therefore, the fourth Gospel, it was the Christian fact, which constrained the Fathers of Nicæa and Chalcedon to search out formulas fitted to give an account of

[1] In my first edition (I., p. 140), I expressed myself as follows: "The only aim which is positively excluded by what we have just gathered from the author's declaration (xx. 30, 31), is the speculative or didactic aim, the design of satisfying the understanding by giving to Christian dogma a new development." Reuss quotes this statement, suppressing the words: "The intention of *satisfying the understanding*." Now it is precisely these omitted words which explained what I here understood by a *didactic* aim. It is very clear that in narrating John proposed to himself to *teach*; the sole question is whether this instructive narrative had as its aim to confirm faith, as he claims himself and as I claim also, or was made with a view to *satisfy the understanding*. To suppress these last words, is to render my thought unrecognizable and absurd. In my second edition, I had already, to avoid all that was equivocal, entirely suppressed in this sentence the term *didactic*, and said: "The only aim excluded . . ., is the philosophical or speculative aim." (I., p. 360).

this contrast, which makes the supreme grandeur of Christianity, at the same time that it is its greatest mystery.[1]

I take pleasure in closing the study of this subject with the following lines from B. Weiss, in which I find my own opinion fully expressed: "To set forth the glory of the divine Logos as he had beheld it in the earthly life of Jesus (i. 14), as it had more and more magnificently revealed itself in conflict with unbelieving and hostile Judaism, and as it had led receptive souls to a faith ever more firm, to a contemplation ever more blessed,—this is what the evangelist desires. This fundamental idea of the narrative is in no degree detrimental to its historical character, because it is derived from the facts themselves which had been a living experience to the author, and because he confines himself to the demonstration of their realization in the history."[2]

Soon after the destruction of Jerusalem, the Apostle John, freed from all duty to his own people, came to Asia Minor to settle there. There the magnificent plantations which were due to the labors of the Apostle Paul were flourishing. But the prophecy of that same apostle: "I know that after my departure grievous wolves shall enter in among you, not sparing the flock" (Acts xx. 29), began to be fulfilled. An apostolic hand was needed to direct these churches. Around Ephesus was spread out the fairest field of Christian labor. We have already said, with a great writer: "The centre of gravity of the Church was no longer in Jerusalem; it was not yet in Rome; it was in Ephesus." Moreover, this city was not only the great commercial entrepot between Asia and Europe, but also the centre of a rich and active intellectual exchange between the religious and philosophical movements of the Orient and occidental culture. It was the rendezvous of the orators of all schools, of the partisans of all systems.

On such a theatre the Palestinian apostle must have grown daily, not, doubtless, in the knowledge of the person and work of Jesus, but in the understanding of the manifold relations, sympathetic or hostile, between the Gospel and the different tendencies of human philosophy. Those Christian populations to which St. Paul had opened the way of salvation by instructing them with respect to the contrast between the state of sin and the state of grace, and by showing them the means of passing from the one to the other, John now introduced into the full knowledge of the

[1] We do not return here to the aims set forth by Baur and Hilgenfeld. We think that the remarks, pp. 205 ff., may be sufficient.

[2] *Introduction to the Commentary on the Gospel of John*, p. 41. Among the recent hypotheses, we will further indicate, as an especially curious specimen, the system set forth by Noack in his work: *Aus der Jordan-Wiege nach Golgotha*, 1870: Jesus, the son of Mary and a Samaritan soldier, even in consequence of this dishonorable birth, came to regard God as his father. He lived in a continual state of ecstasy which he maintained by factitious means,—fasting, for example. After having kept himself at this artificial elevation, when he was no longer able to continue thus he sought death, and the one who aided him in the realization of this desire, and became accessory to this last act of his life was—Judas. He was *the disciple whom Jesus loved;* he was the author of the fourth Gospel, which was afterwards changed, but whose primitive sense Noack has re-established. Jesus died on Gerizim whither he had retired with his seven disciples, and where, by the aid of Judas, he fell into the hands of his enemies and was set free from life.

person of the Saviour Himself; he spread out before their eyes a great number of striking facts which, for one reason or another, tradition had left in obscurity, and many sublime teachings which had been deeply engraved on his heart, and which he alone had preserved; he described the relations, full of love and condescension, which the Lord had sustained towards His own friends, and the proofs which He had given them, in their intimate association, of His divine greatness and His filial relation to the Father. All these elements of the knowledge of Christ, which he brought with him, gain a new value through the connection in which they were placed, in such a region, with the speculations of all sorts which were there current.

The day came, after many years no doubt, when the churches said to themselves that the apostle, who was the depositary of such treasures, would not live always, and did not belong to them alone; and, measuring the distance between the teaching which they had enjoyed and that which they found recorded in the existing Gospels, they requested John to commit to writing what he had related to them. He consented, and he opened his work with a preamble in which, putting his narrative in connection with the efforts of human wisdom of which he was daily a witness, he fixed with a firm hand the central fact of the evangelical history, the incarnation, and reminded every reader of the vital importance of the history which he was about to read: The Christ, the subject of this narrative, would be for him *life*—as for the disciples—if he received Him; *death*—as for the Jews—if he rejected Him (John i. 1–18).

At a later time, the *first Epistle* of the same apostle proceeded from his apostolic working in the same churches, in which writing he addresses himself as a father to mature man, to young men and to children, and in which he makes allusion in the very first lines to the testimony which he bears unceasingly among them respecting that great fact of the incarnation which he has, as it were, *seen with his eyes* and *handled with his hands.* Some have been disposed to find in ver. 4: "And we write unto you" (comp. ii. 14, 21, 26, etc.), an allusion to the composition and sending of the Gospel. We do not think that we are authorized by the context to apply these expressions to any other work than the epistle itself.

The *two small epistles* were issued in the same surroundings. They seem to us, indeed, to belong to the same author. Independently of the identity of style, what other person than John could have designated himself simply by this title: *The Elder* (ὁ πρεσβύτερος), without adding to it his name? An official presbyter of the Church of Ephesus could not have done this, since he had colleagues, elders as well as himself; and if this word is taken here in the sense which it has in the fragment of Papias: *an immediate disciple of the Lord,* no other than the Apostle John could appropriate to himself this name in so absolute a way and as an exclusive title.

Finally, it was no doubt still later, during a temporary exile and under the impression of the recent persecution by Domitian, that John composed his last work: the *Apocalypse,* in which, beholding, as if from the summit

of a mountain, the century which had passed away and those which were to follow, he completes the idea of the Christ *come* by that of the Christ *coming again*, and prepares the Church for the prolonged conflicts and for the final crisis which are to precede His return.[1]

One fact is fitted to excite the reflection of thinking men. St. Paul, the founder of the churches of Asia Minor, cannot fail to have left his type of doctrine deeply impressed on the life of those churches. And yet the Pauline imprint is, as it were, effaced in all the theological literature of Asia Minor in the second century. And this disappearance is by no means the effect of a weakening, of a decay: there is a substitution. There is the appearance of a new imprint, of equal dignity at least with that which preceded it,—the trace of another influence no less Christian, but of a different character. Another equally powerful personality has passed that way, and given a peculiar and altogether new stamp to the Christian life and thought of those countries. This phenomenon is the more remarkable, since the history of the Church of the West presents an entirely opposite one. Here the Pauline type continues; it reigns without a rival even to the third and fourth centuries; it is found anew at every moment in the conflicts of a purely anthropological character which agitate this portion of the Church. And when it is gradually effaced, it is not in order to give place to another quite as elevated, quite as spiritual, but it is by a way of gradual enfeeblement and a process of growing materialization and ritualism.

This grand fact ought to be sufficient to prove that the two Johannean books, which are the documents of the new type impressed on the churches of Asia—the fourth Gospel and the first Epistle—are not the works of a Christian of second rank, of some unknown disciple, but that they proceed from one of the *peers* of the apostle to the Gentiles, from one of those disciples who had drunk from the first source, from an immediate and peculiarly intimate heir of Christ.

We well understand what stays a certain number of excellent minds, at the moment of closing in the tribunal of their own consciousness the acts of this great process by a decision favorable to the apostolic origin of our Gospel. They are afraid that, by recognizing in Christ the appearance of a divine being, they will lose from Him the true man. This anxiety will vanish away as soon as they shall have substituted for the traditional notion of the incarnation the true Biblical notion of that supreme fact. From the truly Scriptural point of view, indeed, there are not in Christ two opposite and contradictory modes of being, which move together side by side in one and the same person. What the apostles show us in Him is a human mode of existence *substituted*, by the voluntary humiliation of the Saviour of men, for His divine mode of existence,—then transformed, by a holy and normal development, in such a way as to be able to serve as an organ for the divine life and to realize the original glory of the Son of God. And let us not forget that this transformation of our human existence into a

[1] See, for the reasons which do not allow us to place the writing of the Apocalypse earlier than this, my *Etudes bibliques*, 3d ed., vol. II., pp. 325-330.

glorified humanity is not accomplished in Christ alone; it is accomplished in Him only to the end of its realization through Him in all those who unite themselves to Him by faith: "To all who received Him gave he the power to become children of God, even to those who believe on His name; and [indeed] the Word became flesh" (i. 13, 14). If the Son for a time abandons the divine condition in order to descend into our human mode of being, it is to impel us to that upward movement which, from the day of His incarnation, He impresses, even in His own person, upon the history of humanity, which He communicates, from the day of Pentecost, to all believers, and the end of which is to be: *God all in all*, as its starting-point was: *God all in one.*

The domain of *being* passes infinitely beyond that of thought—not of absolute thought, but of ours. Do we not see, even in our human life which is so limited, the inspirations of love outrunning infinitely the calculations of the understanding? How much more when the question is of the inspirations of the divine love as related to the thoughts of the human mind.

To accept the living gift of eternal love by letting it descend through faith into the sphere of human life, is to accomplish three equally salutary things. It is to dethrone man in his own heart; for the Son of God, by voluntarily humbling Himself, impels us to the sacrifice of self (Phil. ii. 5 ff.). It is to open heaven to him; for such a gift is an indissoluble bond between the heart of God and that of every man who accepts it. It is to make the believer the eternal dwelling-place of God; for Christ in him is God in him. By this means, God reigns.

But suppress this gift by refusing or lessening it,—and this is the end for which those are laboring who make the fourth Gospel a theological treatise instead of a history,—the human sphere shuts in again upon itself; immediately man raises himself erect; he feeds no longer upon anything except himself; God withdraws. Man assumes the throne and reigns here on earth.

The thought of the gift of the only-begotten Son is not the fruit of human speculation; it bears in itself the seal of its divine origin. God alone can have had this thought, because God alone can love thus.

Let us enter now, with this certainty, upon the study of the pages in which this great fact of the divine love has been distinctly revealed on earth; and may those pages themselves speak with a louder voice than any pleader, and the moment come when they shall no more need an advocate!

INTRODUCTION.

AFTER the General Introduction contained in the first part of this volume, it only remains for us, in the Special Introduction to the Commentary, to treat of the *plan* of the Gospel and of the most important *documents* in which the text of this writing has been preserved to us.

CHAPTER FIRST.

THE PLAN OF THE GOSPEL.

THERE is a marked difference between the exegesis of the Fathers and modern works on the Gospel of John. With the former the thought of a plan, of a systematic arrangement, seems almost to have no existence, so completely is the historical character of the story assumed. The narrative is regarded as the simple reproduction of the history. It is no longer so in the modern conception. The agency of a governing idea is made to appear in the story. According to the view of which Baur's work is still the most remarkable expression, the *idea* plays even so decisive a part in this evangelical composition, that it not only determines its arrangement, but furnishes the substance of the story so far that, according to this critic, fact, as such, is almost annihilated, and that the allegorical exposition, the name of which until now recalled the worst days of exegesis, is again become the true method of interpretation. The fourth Gospel, a thoroughly systematic work, is as independent of real history as the Ethics of Spinoza can be of sensible reality.

This reversal of the point of view has been brought about gradually. The works of Lampe, de Wette, Schweizer and Baur seem to me to be the noteworthy points in this scientific elaboration.[1]

Lampe was the first, according to Lücke, to propose a general division of the Gospel. It was still very imperfect. Placed between a prologue

[1] For this exposition we are much indebted to the work of Luthardt, *Das Joh. Evang.* 2d ed., i. p. 200–222.

(i. 1–18) and an epilogue (xx. 30–xxi. 25), the narrative is subdivided into two parts: A. The public ministry of the Lord, i. 19–xii. 50. B. The last acts of His life, xiii. 1–xx. 29. Lampe had thus put his finger on one of the principal articulations of the Gospel. All those who, since his day, have effaced the line of division between ch. xii. and xiii. seem to me to have retrograded in the understanding of John's work.

Eichhorn made no change in this division. He merely designated the two principal parts of the narrative in a different way: 1. The first, i. 19–xii. 50, proves that Jesus is the promised *Messiah;* 2. The second, xiii.–xx., contains the account of the *last days* of His life. Here was no real improvement. What Eichhorn indicates as the contents of the first twelve chapters is really applicable only to the first four; and the subjects of the two parts, thus designated, are not logically co-ordinate with each other.

Before Eichhorn, Bengel[1] had attempted to found the division of the Gospel on another principle. After having ingeniously marked the correspondence between the initial week (i. 19–ii. 11) and the final week (xii. 1–xx. 31), he divided the intermediate history according to the journeys to the feasts: Passover, ii. 13; Pentecost (according to Bengel) v. 1; Tabernacles, vii. 2. But this arrangement evidently rests on a too external order of events; since it has the disadvantage of effacing the division, distinctly marked by the Evangelist himself and already pointed out by Lampe, between chs. xii. and xiii.

Bengel was, nevertheless, followed by Olshausen, who assumed, according to this principle of division, the following four parts; 1. i.–vi.; 2. vii.–xi.; 3. xii.–xvii.; 4. xviii.–xxi. Lücke himself, in his first two editions, despaired of reaching a more profound plan, and contented himself with endeavoring to improve the division which is founded on this principle.

De Wette, first of all, discerned and set forth the unfolding of a single idea in our Gospel. The *glory of Christ*,—such is, according to him, the central thought of the entire work: 1. The first chapter sets forth the idea in a summary way;—2. The first part of the narrative (ii.–xii.) exhibits it to us as translated into action in the ministry of Jesus, and that: A, by particular examples (ii.–vi.); B, by the preparation of the catastrophe during the last sojournings of Jesus in Judea (vii.–xii.);—3. The glory of the Lord manifests itself in all its splendor in the second part of the narrative (xiii.–xx.), and that: A, inwardly and morally, in His suf-

[1] *Gnomon*, N. T., 1742.

ferings and death (xiii.–xix.); and B, outwardly and sensibly, by the triumphant fact of His resurrection (xx.).

This grand and beautiful conception, by means of which de Wette has certainly made an epoch in the understanding of our Gospel, governed exegesis for a certain period. Lücke yielded to its influence in his third edition; but he introduced into this plan a subdivision which must not be lost sight of. It is the separation between chs. iv. and v. Until ch. iv., indeed, the opposition to Jesus does not become distinctly noticeable. From ch. v., onward it is the governing element in the narrative, and goes on increasing up to ch. xii.

Baumgarten-Crusius, taking advantage of the conception of de Wette and of the subdivision introduced by Lücke, presented the following arrangement: 1. The works of Christ, i.–iv.; 2. His struggles, v.–xii.; 3. His moral victory, xiii.–xix.; 4. His final glory, xx. This was de Wette's idea, better formulated than it had been by de Wette himself. It was the first altogether rational division of the entire contents of our Gospel. Almost all the principal articulations of the narrative were established and pointed out: that between chs. iv. and v.; that between chs. xii. and xiii.; finally, that between xix. and xx.

This division, however, only took account of the divine and objective factor of the narrative, if we may so speak,—Christ and His manifestation. But there is another element in John's narration, the human, subjective factor—the conduct of men towards the Lord on occasion of His revelation, the faith of some and the unbelief of others.

Alexander Schweizer demanded a place for this human element in the arrangement of the narrative. He accorded to it even the decisive part, and this while especially laying emphasis on the side of unbelief. He adopted the following plan, which brings out precisely the leading articulations that we have just indicated. 1. The struggle makes itself known in the distance; i.–iv.; 2. It breaks forth in all its violence, v.–xii.; 3. The denouement, xiii.–xx. Understood in this way the Gospel becomes a drama, and assumes a tragic interest. But in the conduct of men towards the Lord, unbelief is only one side. Does not the element of faith remain too much in the background in this conception of Schweizer? The factor thus neglected could not fail to obtain its revenge.

Before coming to this point which was easy to be foreseen, we ought to mention some remarkable works which appear to us to connect themselves, if not historically, at least in principle, with the points of view already indicated. Like de Wette and Baumgarten-Crusius, Reuss makes

the general arrangement of the Gospel rest upon the revelation of Christ.[1] He assumes three parts: 1. Jesus reveals Himself to *the world*, i.–xii.; (A) first, enrolling, i.–iv.; (B) then, selecting, v.–xii. 2. He reveals Himself to *His own*, xiii.–xvii., endeavoring to cause the speculative ideas, expressed in a dogmatic or polemical form in the first part, to penetrate their hearts, and to transmute these ideas into their inmost life. Up to this point the order is logical, and in this brief form of words are comprehended many of the ideas fitted to throw light upon the progress of the work of Christ in our Gospel. But here a difficulty presents itself, which arises from the general point of view at which Reuss takes his stand with regard to the work of John; the rational division is exhausted. There is no third term which can be logically placed beside the *world* and *the believers*. And yet the Gospel is not ended, and a place must be assigned to the three chapters which still remain. Reuss makes of them a third part, which he entitles: "The denouement of the two relations previously established;" xviii.–xx. It is difficult to understand how the narrative of the death and resurrection of Christ can undo the knot formed by the twofold relation of Jesus to the world and believers. Here is the reply of this author: "In that Jesus remains dead for the unbelievers, and rises victorious for the believers." If in a matter of this kind a clever phrase were sufficient, one might declare oneself satisfied. But can Reuss be so himself? Must he not perceive that this purely historical denouement is not consistent with a speculative Gospel, an *ideal* work such as *his* Gospel of John is? By this course we must reach the point of seeing in these last historical facts nothing but a religion or a system of ethics in action. And indeed how does Reuss close his analysis of the Gospel? By these words: "It is thus that the history, even to the end, is the mirror of religious truths." What! the events of the death and resurrection of the Saviour placed in the same rank with the metaphysics of John! But there remains no other way for Reuss to make of the Gospel a homogeneous whole, and logically to co-ordinate the third part with the two others. We see at what a price this higher conception must be purchased, according to which *the reflections of John* on the person of Christ form the substance of the fourth Gospel!

Ebrard returns to the plan of Bengel, and once more bases the order of our Gospel upon the feast-journeys. But he attaches a more profound meaning to this apparently quite external principle of division. He

[1] *Hist. de la Théol. chrét.*, 2d ed. t. ii., pp. 392–394. *Die Geschichte der heil Schr. N. T.*, 5th ed., 1874, § 221.

justly remarks that the journeys of Jesus to Judea are the natural turning points of the history, since, Jerusalem being the central point of opposition, each visit of Jesus to that capital, instead of being a step towards His glorious coming, became one towards the catastrophe. Nevertheless, we have already seen, and we shall see still further, the insufficiency of this division.

As de Wette had made everything rest upon the objective element, the manifestation of Jesus' glory, and as Schweizer had made especially conspicuous one of the two subjective factors, unbelief, it was natural that an interpreter should lay hold of the other, faith. This is what Baur has done. He sees in our Gospel the (ideal) history of the development of faith. Baur consecrated to this task the resources of a mind most sagacious and most fully determined not to recoil at the presence of any obstacle which the text presented to him; and he has thus powerfully contributed to demonstrate the unity of John's work. He divides the Gospel into nine sections, which, however, the prologue being set aside and certain secondary divisions passed without notice, can be reduced to five: 1. The first manifestations of the Word, and the first symptoms of faith and unbelief which resulted therefrom, i–vi.; 2. The (dialectic) victory of faith over its opposite, unbelief, vii.–xii.; 3. The positive development of faith, xiii.–xvii. Having reached this point, Baur meets the same difficulty as Reuss. How to pass from *idea* to history, from the dialectic development of faith to the positive facts of the death and resurrection of the Saviour? The idea demands nothing further. This is the way in which Baur continues; 4. The death of Jesus appears as the work of unbelief; 5. His resurrection, as the consummation of faith. Such is the meaning of xviii.–xx. But, from this author's point of view, this last part remains, nevertheless, a superfetation, as in the case of Reuss. The Passion and Resurrection are facts of too weighty a character to make it possible for them to have their place seriously assigned in the account of the dialectic development of faith, and to be made mere landmarks on the road which leads from the objection of Nathanael (ch. i.) to the cry of faith given by Thomas (ch. xx.). We must either idealize the fourth Gospel to its very end, or, by a retroactive conclusion, starting from the truly historical character of the last part, must recognize also that of the preceding parts.[1]

[1] We may see here the difficulty presenting itself, at a particular point, which attaches everywhere to the philosophical (Hegelian) view on which the theology of Baur rests. In virtue of what logical necessity does the idea pass out of its pure existence to translate itself into fact? The pure idea has no right to go out of itself, in order to transform itself into a real world. Only the world exists, and it is necessary to give it a place in the system.

Luthardt accepted almost wholly the results of the work of Baur in regard to the special point with which we are now concerned. Only he justly lays down as the basis of the development of faith the historic revelation of Christ, so properly emphasized by de Wette. The Son displays His glory; faith springs up, but at the same time unbelief awakes; and soon Jesus is unable to manifest further the divine principle which is in Him, except in conflict with the hostile elements which surround him. Nevertheless, in the midst of this conflict faith gathers strength among the disciples, and the moment arrives when Jesus, after having broken with the people and their rulers, gives Himself entirely to the faith of His own followers and impresses upon it the seal of completeness. Accordingly, Luthardt supposes the following three parts: 1. Jesus begins to reveal Himself as Son of God, i.–iv.; 2. Jesus continues to give testimony to Himself, while contending with Jewish unbelief, v.–xii.; 3. Jesus gives Himself completely to the faith of His own, xiii–xx.

Luthardt, in the footsteps of Baur, seems to me more successfully than any one else to have penetrated into the spirit of the book and into the inner thought which directed the course of the narrative. And yet the defective point in the plan which he proposes is obvious; it is found in the last section. How are we to find a place for the account of the Passion in the third section, entitled: *Jesus and His own?* Luthardt here mingles in one group elements which are altogether heterogeneous.

Meyer's division appears to me to be rather a retrograde step than an advance. On the one hand, it raises secondary parts to the position of principal parts; for example, in the first eleven chapters, which Meyer divides into four sections: 1. First revelations of the glory of the Son, i. 1.–ii. 11; 2. Continuation of this revelation in the presence of growing belief and unbelief, ii. 12–iv. 54.; 3. New revelations and progress of unbelief, v.–vi.: 4. Unbelief having reached its culmination, vii.–xi. On the other hand, Meyer unites quite distinct parts in one, when he joins together chaps. xii.–xx. in one group, entitled: 5. The supreme manifestation of the glory of Jesus before, in, and after the Passion.

Arnaud[1] has returned to the division of Bengel, Olshausen and Ebrard, according to the feast-journeys. Thus, between the prologue and the resurrection, he points out five parts corresponding with the five journeys indicated by the evangelist: 1. ii. 13, (Passover); 2. v., (a feast not designated); 3. vii. 2, (Tabernacles); 4. x. 22, (Dedication); 5. xii. 1, (Passover). In addition to the disadvantage already pointed out, of effacing

[1] *Commentaire sur le. N. T.*, t. ii. 1863.

the resting point of the narrative which is clearly marked by the evangelist at the end of ch. xii., this division has the further one of making an outside matter of that entire portion of the narrative,—so important nevertheless,—which precedes the first feast-journey, i. 19–ii. 12.

Lange discovers seven sections in the narrative: 1. The welcome given to Christ by the friends of the light, i. 19–iv. 54; 2. The conflict between Christ and the elements of darkness, v. 1–vii. 9; 3. The continually increasing fermentation, vii. 10–x. 21; 4. The complete separation between the heterogeneous elements, x. 22–xiii. 30; 5. The Lord among the friends of the light, xiii. 31–xvii. 26; 6. The Lord in the midst of His enemies, a conqueror in outward defeat, xviii. 1–xix. 42; 7. The victory accomplished, xx. This division seems to me a movement backward, rather than an advance.

F. de Rougemont, in his translation of *Olshausen's* Commentary, 1844, has traced the plan, which, so far as relates to the distinction and arrangement of the parts, seems to me to approach most nearly to the truth: 1. Jesus attracts to Himself the souls which do the truth, i.–iv.; 2. He reveals Himself to the world which rejects Him, v.–xii.; 3. He manifests Himself fully to His disciples, xiii.–xvii.; 4. After having accomplished everything, He dies, xviii.–xix.; 5. He rises from the dead and becomes through the Holy Spirit the source of life for believers, xx. The only defect in this arrangement appears to me to lie in the designation of the contents of certain parts and in the absence of a distinct logical relation established between them.

The foregoing review has made evident, in succession, the three principal factors in the narrative of our Gospel: 1. Jesus and His manifestation; 2. Faith; 3. Unbelief; or to state it more precisely, the manifestation of Jesus as Messiah and as Son of God; the birth, growth, and completing of faith in the disciples; the parallel development of the national unbelief. De Wette, Schweizer and Baur have shown us in their plans the most remarkable examples of three divisions founded solely or mainly on one of these factors. But we have seen the impossibility of making either one or another part of the narrative find its place in the frame-works proposed by these three men. This fact has an easy explanation, if our Gospel is a work of a really historical character. A purely rational framework applied to history must always retain something of artificiality, and betray its insufficiency on some side. Fact must always go beyond the idea, because it includes the incalculable element of freedom. Let us, then, renounce synthetical divisions which are more or less connected

with the opinion that the fourth Gospel is a work essentially speculative, and, without bringing to this question any preconceived idea, let us allow the narrative to act upon us and reveal to us its own secret. It seems to me that we shall, without difficulty, discern five groups which have a natural gradation and which the efforts already indicated have successively brought to light.

1. i. 19–iv. 54: *Jesus* reveals Himself as the Messiah. With this fundamental facts are connected, on the one side, the birth and the first growths of faith; on the other, the first scarcely perceptible symptoms of unbelief.

2. v.–xii.: The national *unbelief* develops itself rapidly and powerfully, and that on the foundation of the growing revelation of Jesus manifesting Himself ever more clearly as the Son of God; at the same time, there is wrought out, subsidiarily, the development of faith in the disciples, by means of those very struggles.

3. xiii.–xvii.: *Faith* develops itself and reaches its highest point of strength and light in the disciples during the last hours which they spend with their Master; and this development is wrought by means of the last revelations of Jesus, and in consequence of the expulsion of the faithless disciple in whose person unbelief had gained a foothold, even in the bosom of the apostolic college.

4. xviii.–xix.: The national *unbelief* consummates its work by the murder of the Messiah, while the calm radiance of the glory of the latter penetrates that gloomy night, and the silent growth of faith continues in the few disciples whose eyes are still open to receive these divine splendors.

5. xx. (xxi.): The *Resurrection*, that supreme revelation of Jesus as the Son of God, completes the victory of *faith* over the last remnants of unbelief in the company of the Twelve.

Exegesis will show whether this summary of the narrative is in conformity with the text and the spirit of the writing. If it is, the three principal elements, which we have pointed out are met with again, and are developed simultaneously and face to face in all parts of the narrative, but with this difference, that the first, the revelation of Jesus, forms the continuous basis of the narrative, and that the two others unfold themselves alternately, the one with an ever clearer brightness, the other in more and more sombre colors, on this permanent basis. To sum up: From i. 18–xx. 29 we see Jesus revealing Himself continuously as the Christ and the Son of God; under the influence of this growing manifestation, faith is born and unbelief awakes, i.–iv.; the latter gets the mastery in the midst

of the nation, v.–xii.; the former attains its relative perfection in the last conversations of Jesus with His disciples, xiii.–xvii.; finally, unbelief is consummated, xviii.–xix.; and faith reaches its completeness, xx. (xxi.).

There is in this arrangement nothing systematic, nothing factitious. It is the photography of the history. If exegesis proves that this plan, at once so natural and so profound, is indeed that of this book, we shall find in this fact an important confirmation of the truly historical character and the seriously practical aim of our Gospel.

Of the plans which have been proposed since the publication of this commentary, we mention only the following:

That of Milligan and Moulton[1] is absolutely the same with the one which we have just sketched, with the exception of the last two parts, the Passion and the Resurrection, which they combine in a single one under this title: the apparent victory and real defeat of unbelief. It does not seem to us that this is an advance. The element of faith is thereby too far effaced.

Westcott[2] accepts the grand division of Reuss: revelation of Christ to the world (i.–xii.); revelation of Christ to the disciples (extending this latter even to the end) xiii.–xx. But it is not possible to place the story of the Passion under the general title of the revelation to the disciples.

In 1871, in the *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, Hönig, presented the following plan: The manifestation of the Logos in the person of Jesus—this is the general idea. It unfolds itself in three phases: 1. i.–vi.: the manifestation of the Logos; 2. vii.–xii.: the selection between the opposite elements; 3. xiii.–xx.: The catastrophe resulting from this selection and issuing in the victory of the Logos. But we do not altogether see the reason of the opposition thus established between the first two parts. The selection between the opposite elements has begun from the first chapter; and the revelation of Jesus continues after chap. vi., as before. The same is the case in the last part. The revelation of the Logos remains even to the end the groundwork of the narrative, and that as the principle of a selection the description of which also fills the whole book.

As on a day in spring the sun rises in a serene sky; the ground, moistened by the snows, absorbs greedily his warm rays; everything which is susceptible of life awakens and revives; nature is in travail. Nevertheless, after some hours vapors rise from the moist earth; they unite and form an obscure canopy; the sun is veiled; the storm threatens. The

[1] *Popular Commentary*, Edinburgh, 1880. [2] *The Gospel according to John*, London, 1882.

plants under the impulse which they have received, nevertheless accomplish their silent progress. At length, when the sun has reached the meridian, the storm breaks forth and rages; nature is abandoned to destructive forces; it loses for a time the star which gives it life. But at evening the clouds are scattered; the calm returns, and the sun reappearing with a more magnificent splendor than that which accompanied its rising, casts on all these plants—children of his rays—a last smile and a sweet adieu; thus, as it seems to us, the work of St. John unfolds itself. This plan, if it is real, is not the work of theological reflection; it is the product of history, long meditated upon. Conceived in the calmness of recollection and the sweetness of possession, it has nothing in common with the combinations of metaphysical effort or the refined calculations of ecclesiastical policy, except what a criticism which is foreign to the spirit of this book tries to ascribe to its author.

CHAPTER SECOND.

THE PRESERVATION OF THE TEXT.

THE text of our Gospel has come down to us in three sorts of documents; *Manuscripts*, ancient *Versions* and citations of the *Fathers*.

I.

The Manuscripts.

The manuscripts (MSS.) are divided as is well-known, into two great classes: those which are written in uncial letters, called *majuscules* (Mjj.), and those in which we find the rounded and cursive writing in use since the tenth century of our era, *the minuscules* (Mnn.).[1] The text of our Gospel is contained, in whole, or in part, in 31 Mjj. and about 500 Mnn. which are now known.

I. The majuscules, of which the most ancient have acquired in some sort an individual value in critical science, can be divided into three groups: 1. The *vetustissimi, i. e.* those which date from the fourth and fifth centuries, eight in number. 2. The *vetustiores*, going back to the sixth and seventh centuries, six in number. 3. The *vetusti*, or simple veterans, which proceed from the eighth, ninth and tenth centuries, seventeen in

[1] We shall not speak here of the *Evangelistaria* and *Lectionaria*, containing only the collection of the portions of the gospels and epistles which were appointed to be regularly read in public worship.

number. They are designated, since Wetstein's time, by means of the capital letters of the Latin, Greek or even Hebrew alphabets.[1]

The first group at present includes four MSS., more or less complete, and four documents more or less fragmentary.

1. *Cod. Sinaiticus* (ℵ); at St. Petersburg; discovered by Tischendorf, Feb. 4th, 1859, in the monastery of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai; dating, according to this scholar, from the first part of the fourth century; according to others, Volkmar for example, from the end of the fourth or the beginning of the fifth century; written probably at Alexandria; retouched by several correctors. It contains our Gospel without any lacuna. Published by Tischendorf, Leipsic, 1863.

2. *Cod. Vaticanus* (B); dating, according to Tischendorf, from the middle of the fourth century; according to most, earlier than the preceding and the most ancient of all; probably written in Egypt; containing our Gospel without any lacuna; published by Tischendorf, *Nov. Testam. Vaticanum, Lipsiæ*, 1871.

3. *Cod. Ephraemi* (C), No. 9 of the Imperial Library of Paris, *rescriptus;* according to Tischendorf, of the first part of the fifth century; written probably in Egypt; retouched in the sixth and ninth centuries. In the twelfth century, the text of the New Testament was effaced to make room for that of the works of Ephrem, a father of the Syrian Church. The ancient writing has been restored by chemical means, but this manuscript presents still considerable lacunae. Of our Gospel, only the following eight passages have been recovered: i. 1–41; iii. 33–v. 16; vi. 38–vii. 3; viii. 34–ix. 11; xi. 8–46; xiii. 8–xiv. 7; xvi. 21–xviii. 36; xx. 26 to the end of the Gospel.

4. *Cod. Alexandrinus* (A); at London; of the second half of the fifth century; written probably at Alexandria. One lacuna only in our Gospel: vi. 50–viii. 52.

5. Seven palimpsest fragments (I) found by Tischendorf in Egypt; dating from the fifth and sixth centuries, and in John containing some passages of chaps. iv., xi., xii., xv., xvi. and xix.

6. Fragments brought from an Egyptian monastery (I^b); at London; dating from the fourth or fifth century, according to Tischendorf; containing in John some verses of chaps. xiii. and xvi.

7. A palimpsest fragment (Q); of the fifth century (according to Tischendorf); found in the Wolfenbüttel Library; containing in our Gospel the two following passages: xii. 3–20; xiv. 3–22.

8. Some fragments of a *Cod. Borgianus* (T); at Rome; fifth century (Tischendorf), containing, with the Egyptian translation, called the Sahidic, on the opposite page, the two passages: vi. 28–67; vii. 6–viii. 31.

The *second* group is more meagre. It includes only one manuscript, and five fragments, or collections of fragments.

9. *Cod. Cantabrigiensis* (D); at Cambridge; of the middle of the sixth century (Tischendorf); although presenting certain Alexandrian forms, it was, no doubt, written in the West, and probably in Southern Gaul (see Bleek, *Einl.*, 3d ed., publ.

[1] We shall employ the signs adopted by Tischendorf in his eighth and last edition, Vol. I., 1869, and Vol. II., 1872.

by Mangold, p. 816). Parallel with the Greek text a Latin translation is found, earlier than that of Jerome. Two large lacunae in our Gospel: i. 16–iii. 26; xviii. 13–xx. 13.

10. A palimpsest fragment (P); at Wolfenbüttel; of the sixth century; containing three passages of our Gospel; i. 29–41; ii. 13–25; xxi. 1–11.

11. Fragments of a splendid manuscript (N), four leaves of which are found at London, two at Vienna, six at Rome, thirty-three at Patmos; of the end of the sixth century (Tischendorf); containing of John's Gospel only xiv. 2–10; xv. 15–22.

12. Fragments obtained by Tischendorf from the *Porphyric* Library (Θ^{c} and ε); of the sixth century; passages from chaps. vi. and xviii.

13. Some fragments (T^{b}); at St. Petersburg; of the sixth century; passages from chaps. i., ii. and iv. of our Gospel.

14. Marginal annotations (F^{a}) in the *Cod. Coislinianus* of the Epistles of Paul (H—202 of the National Library of Paris); containing some verses of John from a text of the seventh century (v. 35, and vi. 53, 55).

The third group is the most considerable; it contains eleven manuscripts, more or less complete, and fragments of six others.

15. *Cod. Basilecnsis* (E); at Basle; of the eighth century; it appears to have been used in public worship in one of the churches of Constantinople; it contains the entire Gospel of John.

16. The beautiful Cod. of Paris (L); of the eighth century; it wants only xxi. 15 to the end.

17. Fragments of a Cod. in the Barberini Library (Y); of the eighth century; containing, of our Gospel: xvi. 3–xix. 41.

18. *Cod. Sangallensis* (Δ); written in the ninth century by the Scotch or Irish monks of the monastery of St. Gall; complete, with the exception of xix. 17–35. This Cod. contains an interlinear Latin translation, which is neither that of Jerome nor the version anterior to this Father.

19. *Cod. Boreeli* (F) at Utrecht; of the ninth century; containing the portion of our Gospel from i. 1–xiii. 34; but with numerous lacunae.

20. *Cod. Seidelii* (G); brought from the East by Seidel; at London; of the ninth or tenth century; two lacunae: xviii. 5–19, and xix. 4–27.

21. A second *Cod. Seidelii* (H); at Hamburg; of the ninth or tenth century; some lacunae in chaps. ix., x., xviii. and xx.

22. *Cod. Kyprius* (K); at Paris; of the ninth century; brought from the island of Cyprus to the Colbert Library; complete.

23. The Cod. of *des Camps* (M); at Paris; of the ninth century; a gift to Louis XIV. from the Abbé des Camps in 1706; complete.

24. Fragments of a Cod. from Mount Athos (O); at Moscow; of the ninth century; containing i. 1–4, and xx. 10–13.

25. A fragment belonging to the Library of Moscow (V); of the ninth century; containing i. 1–vii. 39.

26. A Cod. brought from the east by Tischendorf (Γ); at Oxford and St. Petersburg; ninth century; containing iv. 14–viii. 3, and xv. 24–xix. 6.

27. A Cod. brought by the same from the East (Λ); at Oxford; ninth century; complete.

28. Fragments of a Cod. (X) in the University Library at Munich; containing passages from chaps. i., ii., vii.-xvi.

29. A Cod. brought from Smyrna by Tischendorf (Π); ninth century; complete.

30. A Cod. of the Vatican (S); of the year 949; complete.

31. A Cod. at Venice (U); of the tenth century; complete.

It is well known that the oldest of these MSS. bear almost no trace of accentuation, punctuation, or separation between words and periods. These different elements were only gradually introduced into the text; and herein we have one of the means which are employed in estimating the age of the manuscripts. To these elements of the text, therefore, we should not allow any sort of authority.

II. Of the five hundred *minuscules* deposited in the various libraries of Europe, a large number have not yet been collated. Although they are all of more recent origin than the *majuscules*, many of them occasionally offer interesting readings.

II.

B. *The Ancient Versions.*

The translations (Vss.) have the disadvantage of not directly furnishing the text of the New Testament, but leaving it to be conjectured. Nevertheless, they may render important service for the criticism of the text, especially when the question is as to the omission or interpolation of words and passages, and the more so as some of them are much earlier than our most ancient manuscripts.

There are two of them which, for critical importance, surpass all the others; the ancient Syriac translation called *Peschito*, and the ancient Latin translation to which the name *Itala* has been given from a passage in Augustine.

I. *Peschito* (Syr.).

This translation (whose name apparently signifies the *simple*, the *faithful*[1]) goes back, according to the common opinion, as far as the second century of our era; according to *Westcott* and *Hort*, it must in its present form be placed between 250 and 350. It seems to have had, at first, an ecclesiastical destination. It is what its name indicates, faithful without servility. The principal edition, according to which it is cited by Tischendorf, is that of Leusden and Schaaf, 1709 and 1717 (Syr. sch.). Cureton published in 1858, from a Syriac manuscript of the fourth century, dis-

[1] Tischendorf has a different view. See Bleek, *Einl.*, 3d ed., p. 729, and J. B. Glaire, *Intr. hist. et. crit.*, 1862, t. p. 187.

covered in an Egyptian convent, fragments of a Syriac translation of the Gospels, which more recently have been still further increased by some others. They contain the following parts of John: i. 1–42; iii. 6–vii. 37; xiv. 11–28 (Syr. cur.). Another Syriac version exists, which was made at the beginning of the sixth century; it is called the *Philoxenian* translation (Syr. p.). It is absolutely literal.

II. *Itala* (It.).

Much earlier than St. Jerome, probably even from the middle of the second century, there existed a Latin translation of the New Testament. It certainly came from proconsular Africa, where the Greek language was less widely extended than in Italy. It was servile to excess and of an extreme rudeness, but it existed in very varied forms. We possess several copies of these ancient Latin versions, either in the bilingual manuscripts —the Cod. D, for example, which contains the Latin translation designated by d—or in particular manuscripts, such as the *Vercellensis*, of the fourth century, (a); the *Veronensis*, of the fourth or fifth century, (b); the *Colbertensis*, of the eleventh century, (c), etc.

Near the end of the fourth century St. Jerome revised this primitive translation, according to ancient Greek manuscripts. This new version, the *Vulgate* (Vg.) has been preserved to us in several documents of a high antiquity, but quite different from each other; thus the Cod. *Amiatinus* (am.), and the *Fuldensis* (fuld.), both of the sixth century.

Among the other ancient translations, the most interesting for critical use are the three *Egyptian* versions; the fragments of the *Sahidic* translation (Sah.), in the dialect of Upper Egypt; the *Coptic* translation (Cop.), in that of Lower Egypt, and the *Baschmuric* translation (Bas.), in a third dialect, which the younger Champollion supposed to be that of Fayoum (of John, only iv. 28–53). What gives these versions a special interest is, first, their date (the third, or even, according to Bishop Lightfoot, the second century), and, then, their intimate relation to the text of our most ancient Greek manuscripts.

III.

C. *The Fathers.*

The quotations from the New Testament in the writings of the Fathers have, with reason, been called "fragments of ancient manuscripts." Only it must be remembered that very frequently the Fathers cite merely from memory and according the sense. But their citations, nevertheless, remain in a multitude of cases an important critical means of establishing the condition of the text at an epoch to which our MSS. do not go back. The

most important are Irenæus (Ir.), Clement of Alexandria (Clem.), Tertullian (Tert.), Origen (Or.), Chrysostom (Chrys.). The readings of the heretics have, also, a certain value, particularly for the Gospel of John, those of Heracleon, a Gnostic of the second century, of the school of Valentinus; he is the author of the oldest commentary on this writing. Origen has preserved for us some parts of this interesting work.

D. *The Text in general.*

These suggestions, as much abridged as possible, will be sufficient to place the readers in a condition to comprehend the portion of our commentary which relates to the criticism of the text, and to render accessible to them the eighth edition of Tischendorf, in the notes of which the result of the immense labors of that scholar is concentrated.

Since the time of Bengel, it began to be established that the critical documents have a tendency to group themselves, in case of variants, after a more or less regular manner. Thus, in the Epistles of Paul, if we run over several pages of a list of variations, together with an indication of their respective authorities, it will be sufficient to lead us to remark very soon that the documents separate themselves frequently into three more or less fixed groups. In the Gospels, these opposing camps tend, rather, to reduce themselves to two. But the conflict is permanent. It is natural to suppose that these two or three groups of manuscripts represent the different forms of text which were spontaneously formed in the principal regions of the Church from the second and third centuries. As the writings of the N. T. were copied by hand in Syria, in Greece, in Asia Minor, in Egypt, in the Roman province of Africa and in Italy, why should not various readings have been introduced, and then perpetuated and fixed in each of these regions where the Church flourished? Three principal original homes of our textual documents have up to these most recent times been admitted, and as a consequence three principal courses of variations: 1. Egypt, with its great manufacture of manuscripts at Alexandria; 2. The West, particularly Italy and proconsular Africa, with the two centres, Rome and Carthage; 3. Palestine and Syria, whose capital, Antioch, was superseded from the beginning of the fourth century by the new capital of the world, Byzantium; and with these three ecclesiastical regions the three principal families of manuscripts are made in greater or less degree to correspond: 1. The *Alexandrian* group, composed especially of B. C. L., then also of ℵ and finally A, although these last two, especially the second, partake in large measure of

other texts:[1] 2. The *Western* or *Greco-Latin* group, including principally the Majuscules which are a little less ancient, D. F. G., etc., whose Western origin is easily recognized by the Latin translation which accompanies the Greek text; 3. The *Byzantine* or *Syrian* group, containing nearly all the later Majuscules of the eighth, ninth and tenth centuries and almost all the Minuscules. To the first the Egyptian Versions belong; to the second the Old Latin Version, the Itala; to the third the Syriac Version, named Peschito. The most ancient Syriac translation of which Cureton recovered fragments, reproduces especially the Alexandrian text. Among the Fathers, Clement of Alex. and Origen present more the Alexandrian readings; the Latin Fathers, the Western readings; Chrysostom and Theodoret, the Byzantine readings. Although criticism and exegesis appear, more and more, disposed openly to prefer the Alexandrian text, the documents pertaining to which are evidently the most ancient, to the two others, yet there is no denial of all authority to these last two. Tischendorf, in particular, in his seventh ed., and up to the discovery of the Sinaitic MS., believed that he ought to readmit into the text many Byzantine readings, which he had before set aside.

But *Hort* and *Westcott*, after immense labors, have arrived at quite a different view of the history of the text;[2] and one which, if it should come to be accepted, would modify completely this earlier mode of judging. According to them we must distinguish, on one side, the Syrian or Byzantine text and, on the other, three texts anterior to that. The first dates only from the earliest part of the fourth century, while the formation of these last goes back even to the second century. They are: 1. The Alexandrian text; 2. The Western text; and 3. A text which they call *neutral*, that is to say, which has neither the Alexandrian peculiarities, nor the Western peculiarities; which consequently approaches most nearly to the Apostolic text. This last has been preserved for us in the most faithful manner in the Vatican MS., then, in a less degree of purity, in the Sinaitic, so that, where these two manuscripts are in accord, there is scarcely any room for discussion, even when all the other authorities are on the other side. As for the Syrian text, it is a simple compilation, made by means of the three others, which does not have any reading

[1] The Egyptian origin of all these manuscripts has received a recent confirmation through the study of two fragments (Luke vii. 36–44; x. 38–42) belonging to an Evangelistarium of Lower Egypt (of the sixth century). These fragments which were found in a private library in Vienna, present all the readings peculiar to the manuscripts indicated. See the account by Karl Wessely in the *Wiener-Studien* of 1882.

[2] *The New Testament. Introduction*, 1881.

which is original and of a date anterior to the three preceding ones. Its own readings are only the product of a work of revision cleverly accomplished at the end of the third century. There is, therefore, no reason to take the least account of this text, even when the others are not in agreement. It is absolutely without authority. Thus the revolution begun by Mill and Bentley, continued by Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf and Tregelles, is at last consummated. The Byzantine text, which, under the name of *Received Text*, had reigned as sovereign from the time of Erasmus to the eighteenth century, has received its complete and final dismissal.

Let me be allowed, however, not to accept this verdict as a sentence without appeal. I can hardly believe that the Church in Syria, the first established in a heathen country, did not preserve a text for itself, as well as the other countries of Christendom, and that it was obliged to borrow wholly from foreign documents the text of its official translation, the Peschito. I am not ignorant that the Syriac of Cureton, which seems to present a more ancient text than that of the Peschito, approaches more nearly to the Alexandrian. And more learned persons than myself give up the attempt to explain, with our present means, the relation between this text and that of the Peschito. But how can we believe that such a man as Chrysostom would have adopted that of the Peschito for the purpose of making it the foundation of his sermons, if that text had been only the product of a quite recent compilation, not resting on any sort of local authority.[1] To these reasons is to be added that which exegetical experience appears to me to furnish. As there are cases where in my opinion the Greco-Latin text is certainly preferable to the so-called neutral text of B and ℵ, and in general to the reading of all the others, there are also cases, and in considerable numbers, where the texts called ante-Syrian by Hort and Westcott are decidedly inferior, when weighed in the balance of the context, to the Byzantine readings. Meyer himself is obliged to acknowledge this very frequently.

I ask, then, simply that we should keep the protocol open, that the documents should not be used according to an altogether external and mechanical method, and that in each particular case the casting vote should be accorded to exegetical good sense and tact.[2]

[1] See the development of these reasons in the *Revue théologique* of Montauban: *Une nouvelle édition du N. T.*, 1882, i.

[2] I am happy to find myself in agreement in this view with the most learned and one of the most sagacious among the American critics, Ezra Abbot, the recent loss of whom science deplores. See his excellent article on

THE TITLE OF THE GOSPEL.

This title appears in the MSS. in different forms. The simplest is that which we find in ℵ B D: κατὰ Ἰωάννην (*according to John*). The majority of the Mjj. and ℵ (at the end of the book): εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Ἰωάννην, *Gospel according to John.* T. R., with a large number of Mnn.: τὸ κατὰ Ἰ. εὐαγγ., *The Gospel according to John.* Stephen's third edition adds ἅγιον (*holy*) before εὐαγγ., with several Mnn. Some Mnn. read: ἐκ τοῦ κ. Ἰ. εὐαγγ. The Vss. vary also: evang. Johannis (Syr.); ev. per Joh. (Goth.); ev. secundum Joh. (Cop.); ev. sanctum prædicationis Joh. præconis (according to certain edd. of the Syriac).

All these variations seem to prove that this title did not proceed from the hand of the author or the editors of the Gospel. Had it belonged originally to the body of the work, it would be the same, or nearly the same, in all the documents. It was doubtless added when the collection of the Gospels was made in the churches, which formation of a collection was brought about more or less spontaneously in each locality, as is shown by the different order of our four Gospels and of the New Testament writings in general in the canons of the churches. The differences in the titles are, doubtless, explained by the same cause.

But what is the exact sense of this formula: "*according to John?*" From the time of the Manichean Faustus (Augustine, *contra Faustum*, xxxii. 2) even to our day, scholars have been found who have given to κατά, *according to*, a very broad sense: Gospel drawn up according to the type of preaching of Matthew, John, etc. It is thus that Reuss (*Gesch. der heil. Schr. N. T.*, § 177) and Renan (*Vie de Jésus*,, p. xvi.),[1] appear to understand the word. The result of this would be that these four formulas, instead of attesting the fact of the composition of our Gospels by the four men

the variant in John i. 18 in the *Unitarian Review*, June, 1875. This is what he says of our ancient Alexandrian manuscripts: "All these documents, or the greater part of them, often agree in readings which are either clearly false or exceedingly improbable or very doubtful." Thereupon he gives a list of passages for which I would, from my own exegetical experience, substitute the following, borrowing some examples from his list: Matt. xxvii. 49 (the Alex. addition taken from John xix. 34)—Mk. vi. 22 (αὐτοῦ for αὐτῆς)—Luke i. 17 (προσελέυσεται instead of προελ-εύσεται)—John i. 18 (θεός instead of υἱός). Acts xii. 25 (εἰς Ἱερ. instead of ἀπὸ Ἱερ.)—xx. 28 (τοῦ θεοῦ instead of τοῦ κυρίου)—Rom. v. 1. (ἔχωμεν instead of ἔχομεν)—1 Cor. ix. 10 (the Western reading only admissible)—xiii. 3 (καυχήσωμαι!)—Jas. i. 17—2 Pet. ii. 13, etc. In all these cases, as in many others which I omit, it seems to me that a sound exegesis cannot hesitate.

[1] "These formulas merely signify that these were the traditions which proceeded from each one of these apostles, and which were clothed with their authority."

designated in the titles, would, on the contrary, exclude it. But no one in the primitive church ever dreamed of assigning other authors to these four writings than those who are named in the titles; the thought of those who formulated these titles cannot therefore, have been that which is thus ascribed to them. Moreover, this sense of *according to* cannot be at all suitable to the second or the third Gospel; since Mark and Luke have never been regarded as the founders of an independent personal tradition, but only as the redactors of narrations proceeding from Peter and Paul. The title of these two writings should therefore have been: Gospels *according to Peter* and *according to Paul*, if the word *according to* had really had in the thought of the authors of the titles, the meaning which the learned authorities whom we are opposing give to it. The error of these authorities arises from the fact that they give to the term *Gospel* a sense which it did not have in the primitive Christian language. In that language, in fact, this word did not at all designate a *book*, a writing relating the coming of the Saviour, but the good-tidings of *God* to mankind, that is to say, that coming itself; comp. e. g. Mark i. 1; Rom. i. 1. The meaning of our four titles, then, is not: "Book compiled according to the tradition of," but: "The blessed coming of Jesus Christ, related by the care or the pen of. . ." We find the preposition *κατά* frequently employed as it is here, to designate an author himself; so in Diodorus Siculus, when he calls the work of Herodotus "The history according to Herodotus (*ἡ καθ' Ἡρ. ἱστορία*)" or in Epiphanius (Haer. viii. 4), when he says "The Pentateuch according to Moses (*ἡ κατὰ Μωϋσέα πεντάτευχος*)." Reuss presents by way of objection the title of the apocryphal Gospel, *εὐαγγ. κατὰ Πέτρον*. But it is very evident that the one who wished to make this Gospel pass under the name of Peter *intended* to attribute the redaction to this apostle, and so gave to the word *according to* the same sense which we give. As for the well-known phrases *εὐαγγ. κατὰ τοὺς δώδ. ἀποστόλους, καθ' Ἑβραίους, κατ' Αἰγυπτίους* (*according to* the twelve Apostles, the Hebrews, the Egyptians), it is clear that *κατά* designates, in these cases, the ecclesiastical circle from which these writings were supposed to proceed, or that in the midst of which they were current.[1]

[1] We think we may understand that in the passage of his work *Histoire évangélique*, which we read on page 14, Reuss intended to retract his former explanation.

PROLOGUE.

I. 1–18.

EACH evangelist begins his book in a manner appropriate to the aim of his narrative. Matthew proposes to prove the *right* of Jesus to the Messianic throne. He opens his story with His genealogy. Mark desires quite simply to collect *memorials* fitted to give a comprehension of the greatness of the personage whose active work he describes; he throws himself *in mediam rem*, by relating, without an exordium, the beginning of the public ministry of John and of Jesus. Luke proposes to write *a history* in the proper sense of the word: he introduces his narrative, after the manner of the Greek historians, by a preface in which he gives an account of his sources, his method, and his aim. The prologue of John is likewise in close connection with the aim of his narrative. We shall be brought to the understanding of this fact by the study of this remarkable passage which has exercised so decisive an influence on the conception of Christianity even to our own day.

How far does this prologue extend? Only to ver. 5, answers Reuss. The words: *There was a man called John*, in ver. 6, are the beginning of the narrative; this is continued in ver. 14, by the mention of the incarnation of the Word; in ver. 19 by the account of the ministry of the Baptist, and finally with ver. 35 it reaches the ministry of Jesus.

But a glance at the whole passage vv. 6–18 shows that this arrangement does not correspond with the thought of the evangelist. The appearance of the Messiah is already mentioned before ver. 14; since vv. 11–13 directly relate to it; then, if the narrative had really commenced with the mention of John the Baptist in ver. 6, why should his testimony be placed much later (in ver. 15)? The quotation made in ver. 15 comes either too early, if it should be placed in its historical situation which will be exactly described in vv. 27, 30, or too late, if the author wishes to connect it with the mentioning of the appearance of the forerunner in ver. 6. No more can we understand, on Reuss' view, the appropriateness of the religious reflections contained in vv. 16–18, which would strangely interrupt the narrative already begun. It is evident that ver. 18 forms the pendant of ver. 1, and thus closes the cycle which is opened by that verse. The narrative, then, does not begin till ver. 19, and vv. 1–18 form a whole of a peculiar character.

What is the course of the ideas expressed in this preamble? For it is clear that we do not have here a mere pious effusion without any fixed plan.

Lücke supposes two parts: The first, vv. 1–5, describing the *primordial* existence of the Logos; the second, vv. 6–18, tracing summarily His *historical* appearance. This division does not explain the two-fold mention of the historical appearance of the Word ver. 11 (*came*) and ver. 14 (*was made flesh*). It is alleged, no doubt, that the fact is taken up, the second time, more profoundly than the first. But if the progress is to be historical, this does not solve the difficulty.

Olshausen and Lange suppose three sections: 1. vv. 1–5, The *primordial* activity of the Logos; 2. vv. 6–13, His activity during the course of the *Old Covenant;* 3. vv. 14–18, His incarnation; then, His activity in *the Church*. There would be here an historical plan which is complete and rigorously followed. But the question is whether the idea of this progress is truly derived from the text, or whether it is not imported into it. In vv. 6–8 John the Baptist is named alone; there is no indication that he is intended to represent all the prophets, and still less the Old Covenant in general. Besides it would be necessary, according to this plan, to refer the coming of the Logos, described in ver. 11, to the revelations of the Old Covenant, and its regenerating effects which are spoken of in vv. 12, 13, to the spiritual blessings bestowed upon faithful Jews before the coming of Christ. Now it is manifest that the terms employed by John reach far beyond any such application.

Luthardt and Hengstenberg, rejecting the idea of an historical progress, suppose a series of *cycles* which have each of them reference to the totality of the Gospel-history, but reproducing it under different aspects. The first, vv. 1–5, embodies in a summary way, the activity of the Logos up to His coming in the flesh, comprehending therein the general unsuccessfulness of His ministry here on earth. The second cycle, vv. 6–13, takes up the same history again, calling to mind especially the part of the forerunner, with the purpose of coming thereby to the fact of the Jewish unbelief. The third, finally, vv. 14–18, decribes a third time the work of Jesus Christ, and that from the point of view of the extraordinary blessings which it has brought to believers. This plan certainly approaches more nearly to the truth than the preceding ones. Nevertheless, it would be a quite strange procedure to open a narrative by making a threefold summation of it. Moreover, if these three cycles are really intended to present each time the same subject, how does it happen that they have points of departure and ending-points which are altogether different. The starting point of the first is the eternal existence of the Logos; that of the second, the appearance of John the Baptist (ver. 6); that of the third, the incarnation of the Logos (ver. 14). The first ends in the unbelief of the world (ver. 5); the second, in the Israelitish unbelief (ver. 11); the third, in the perfect revelation of God in the person of the Son (ver. 18). Three paragraphs beginning and ending so differently can scarcely be three summaries of the same history.

Westcott divides into two parts: I. The Logos in His eternal existence (ver. 1); II. The Logos in His relation to the creation (vv. 2–18). This second part contains three subdivisions: 1. The fundamental facts (vv. 2–

5); 2. The historical manifestation of the Word in general (vv. 6–13); 3. The incarnation as the object of individual experience (vv. 14–18). This subdivision presents a fair progress, but the great disproportion between the two principal parts does not prepossess one in favor of this outline. And its chief difficulty is that of not sufficiently setting in relief the central idea, the fact of the incarnation of the Logos, and of establishing between the coming of Christ in general and His coming as the object of individual experience, a distinction which is scarcely natural and is not sufficiently indicated in the text.

The Commentary of Milligan and Moulton proposes the following plan: 1. The Word in Himself and in His general manifestations (vv. 1–5); 2. The Word appearing in the world (vv. 6–13); 3. The Word fully revealed by His incarnation (vv. 14–18). But the difference between the last two parts does not distinctly appear.

Gess[1] supposes four parts: 1. The primordial relation of the Logos to God and to the creation (vv. 1–4); 2. The behavior of the darkness towards Him (vv. 5–13); 3. His dwelling as Logos incarnate among men (vv. 14, 15). 4. The happiness which faith in Him procures (vv. 16–18). There would be, according to this view, a correspondence between the first and the third part (the Logos before and after the incarnation) and in the same way also between the second and the fourth (unbelief and faith). This arrangement is ingenious. But does it correspond well with the divisions which are marked in the text itself, especially so far as the last part is concerned? It seems not. Besides, it would appear that the Logos before His incarnation met nothing but unbelief, and as incarnate nothing but faith, which is certainly not the evangelist's thought.

Let us mention finally the arrangement presented by Düsterdieck; 1. The Logos and the critical nature of His appearance (vv. 1–5); 2. The Logos from His divine existence down to His historical appearance (vv. 6–13); 3. The Logos since His historical appearance, as the object of experience and of the testimony of the Church. This plan is broad and simple. But where do we find in the prologue the mentioning of the Old Covenant which answers to the second part? The person of John the Baptist is mentioned on account of his personal role, and not as the representative of the entire Israelitish epoch. Besides, no account is given, according to this course, either of the double mention of the appearance of the Logos (vv. 11, 14), or of the quotation of the testimony of John the Baptist, in ver. 15.

In spite of the criticism of which the arrangement of the prologue which I have proposed has been the object, I can do no otherwise than reproduce it here, as that which, according to my view, corresponds most exactly with the thought of the evangelist. It is summed up in these three words: the Logos, unbelief, faith. The first part presents to us the eternal and creative Logos, as the person who is to become in Jesus Christ the subject of the Gospel-history (vv. 1–4). The second describes human

[1] *Christi Person und Werk* (2d ed.), in the volume: *Das apostolische Zeugniss*, p. 562 f.

unbelief with reference to Him, as it was realized in the most tragic manner in the midst of the people best prepared to receive Him (vv. 5–11). Finally, the third glorifies faith, by describing the blessedness of those who have recognized in Christ the Word made flesh, and have thus gained reentrance into the communion with the Logos and recovery of the life and the truth which man derived from Him before he separated himself from Him (vv. 12–18).

We shall see, by studying the Gospel, that these three fundamental ideas of the prologue are precisely those which preside over the arrangement of the entire narrative, and which determine its grand divisions.

It is undoubtedly difficult, to tell whether we must assign to ver. 5 its place in the first or in the second passage. This verse is the transition from the one to the other, and, at the foundation, it appertains to both. The twelfth and thirteenth verses occupy an analogous position between the second and the third passage. Let us notice, however, that at the beginning of ver. 12 a δέ (*but*) is found, the only adversative particle of the prologue. The apostle seems to have wished, by this means, to mark clearly the opposition between the picture of unbelief and that of faith. This is a point which seems to me not to be taken into account by the numerous interpreters who, like Weiss and Gess, connect vv. 12, 13, with the second part, in order to begin the third at ver. 14; this circumstance induces us rather to begin the third part (that of faith) at ver. 12.

As the overture of an oratorio causes all the principal themes to be sounded which will be developed in the sequel of the work, and forms a prelude thus to the entire piece, so John in this preamble has brought out at the outset the three essential factors of the history which he is going to trace: *the Logos*, then *the unbelief* and *the faith* of which his appearance has been the object.

The general questions to which this passage gives rise will be treated in an appendix following upon the exegesis.

FIRST SECTION.

The Logos. I. 1–14.

It would be difficult not to recognize in these first verses an allusion to the beginning of Genesis. The first words of the two writings manifestly correspond with each other. The *beginning* of which John here speaks can only be that which Moses had made the starting-point of his narrative. But, immediately afterwards, the two sacred writers separate from each other. Starting from the fact of the creation, Moses descends the stream of time and reaches the creation of man (ver. 26). John, having started from the same point, follows the reverse course and ascends from the beginning of things to eternity. It is because his end in view is more remote and because in order to reach farther he must start from a point farther back. The Jewish historian has in view only the foundation of

the theocratic work in Abraham, while the evangelist would reach the redemption of humanity by Jesus Christ. To find Him who shall be the agent of this second creation, instead of descending the course of things, he must ascend even beyond the beginning of the first creation.

At ver. 1, John finds in eternity the subject of the history which he is going to relate, the Logos; at ver. 2, he takes his place with Him at the beginning of time; in the 3d verse, he shows Him to us coöperating in the work of creation, which is the condition of that of Redemption; finally, in the 4th verse, he unveils the relation which from all time has existed between that divine being and humanity, down to the moment when He Himself appeared as a member of this race.

Ver. 1. *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.*[1] These three propositions follow each other like oracles; they enunciate, each of them, one of the features of the greatness of the Logos before His coming in the flesh. The ascending progression which binds them together is indicated, after the Hebrew manner, by the simple copula *καί, καί, and, and.* The *ἐν ἀρχῇ, in the beginning*, manifestly is a reproduction of the first word of Genesis (beréschith). It therefore naturally designates the beginning of the existence of created things. Some Fathers applied it to that divine *wisdom* which the book of Proverbs describes as the *principle* of the universe; but nothing could justify such an extraordinary sense. Several modern writers, such as *Olshausen, de Wette, Meyer*, understand by this beginning *eternity.* In fact, eternity is, not the temporal beginning, but the rational principle, of time. And it is in this sense that the word *ἀρχή* seems to be taken in Prov. viii. 23: "In the beginning, before creating the earth," perhaps also in 1 John i. 1: "That which was from the beginning (*ἀπ' ἀρχῆς*)." Indeed, as *Weiss* observes,[2] the absolute beginning can be only the point from which our *thought* starts. Now such a point is not found in time, because we can always conceive in time a point anterior to that which we represent to ourselves. The absolute beginning at which our minds stop can therefore only be eternity *a parte ante.* It is none the less true, however, that, as this same author acknowledges, the allusion to Gen. i. 1 determines the word *ἀρχή* as the temporal beginning of things. But if the notion of eternity is not found in the word itself, it is nevertheless implied in the logical relation of this dependent phrase to the verb *ἦν, was* (see farther on; comp. *Keil*). The Socinians, in the interest of their doctrine, have applied this word *ἀρχή* to the beginning of the *Gospel preaching*, as Mk. i. 1; Luke i. 2. This sense is evidently incompatible with all that follows; no one any longer defends it at the present day.—The imperfect *ἦν, was*, must designate, according to the ordinary meaning of this tense, the simultaneousness of the act indicated by the verb with some other act. This simultaneousness is here that of the *existence* of the Word with the fact designated by the word *beginning.* "When everything

[1] L and Gregory of Nyssa read ὁ before θεος.

[2] *Lehrbuch der biblischen Theologie*, 4th ed., p. 619.

which has begun began, the Word *was*." Alone then, it did not begin; the Word *was* already. Now that which did not begin with *things*, that is to say, with time, the form of the development of things, belongs to the eternal order. *Reuss* objects, it is true (*Hist. de la théol. chrétienne*, p. 439), that, "if we infer from these words the eternity of the Word, we must infer also from the beginning of Genesis the eternity of the world." This argument is without value. Since in Genesis we do not have the imperfect *was*, but the perfect definite *created*. When John passes to the act of creation (ver. 3), he also abandons the imperfect to make use of the aorist (ἐγένετο). The notion of eternity, as we have seen, is not in the term *in the beginning*, but only in the relation of this term to the imperfect *was*. The term *Word*, no less than the term *in the beginning*, serves to recall the narrative in Genesis; it alludes to the expression: *and God said*, repeated eight times, which is as it were the refrain of that magnificent poem. All these *sayings* of God John gathers as if into one single, living word, endowed with intelligence and activity, from which emanates each one of those particular orders. At the foundation of all those spoken divine words, he discovers the divine speaking Word. But while those resound in time, this exists above and beyond time. The idea of this first proposition is, therefore, that of the *eternity* of the Logos.

The salient word of the second proposition is the preposition πρός, which, with the objective word in the accusative, denotes the movement of approach towards the object or the person serving to limit it. The meaning is, therefore, quite different from what it would have been, if John had said μετά, *in the society of*, or σύν, *in union with*, or ἐν, *in the bosom of*, or παρά, *near to* (xvii. 5). This preposition is chosen in order to express under a local form, as the prepositions in general do, the direction, the tendency, the moral movement of the being called the Word. His aspiration tends towards God. The form, apparently incorrect, by which John connects a preposition of motion (*towards*) with a verb of rest (*was*), signifies that this motion was His permanent state, that is to say, His essence. Comp. 2 Cor. v. 8; Gal. i. 18. This use of the preposition πρός has evidently no meaning except as it is applied to a personal being. We believe that we hear in this an echo of that plural of Genesis which indicates intimate communion (i. 26): "Let *us* make man in *our* image." So in the 18th verse the term *Son* will be substituted for *Word*, as *Father* will take the place of *God*. It is not of abstract beings, of metaphysical principles, that John is here pointing out the relation, but of persons. The end to which the Logos incessantly tends is τὸν θεόν, *God* (with the article); God is thereby designated as a being complete in Himself, independently of the Word Himself. It is not the Logos who makes Him God, even though He is inseparable from His Logos. Hence it results that the existence of the Logos rests on another principle than that of a metaphysical necessity. The idea of this second proposition is that of the *personality* of the Logos and of His intimate communion with God. But thus there is found lying in the Divine existence a mysterious duality. This duality is what the third proposition is designed to resolve.

In this third proposition we must not make θεός (*God*) the subject, and ὁ λόγος (the Word) the predicate, as if John meant to say: And God was the Word. John does not propose in this prologue to explain what God is, but what the Word is. If the word θεός (*God*), although the predicate, is placed at the beginning of the proposition, it is because in this word is contained the progress of the idea relatively to the preceding proposition. An anonymous English writer[1] has recently proposed to place a period after ἦν *was*, and to make ὁ λόγος, *the Word*, the subject of ver. 2. The meaning would thus be: "The Word was in relation with God and was God." Then would follow in ver. 2: "And *this Word* (ὁ λόγος οὗτος) was in the beginning with God." He has not perceived that the threefold repetition of the word ὁ λόγος, *the Word*, in these three first propositions was intentional, and that this form has a peculiar solemnity; comp. the similar repetition of the word κόσμος, ver. 10 and iii. 17. We find here the same grammatical form as in iv. 24 (πνεῦμα ὁ θεός), where the predicate is also placed at the beginning of the clause. The word θεός, *God*, is used without an article, because it has the sense of an adjective and designates, not the person, but the quality. Undoubtedly we must guard against giving it, for this reason, the meaning *divine*, which is the signification of the word θεῖος. The apostle does not mean to ascribe to the Logos that which this adjective would express, a quasi-divinity, a condition intermediate between God and the creature. This idea would be incompatible with the strict monotheism of the Scriptures. The Logos is something different from the most perfect of men or the most exalted of angels; He partakes of θεότης (*deity*). It is when this proposition is thus understood, that it answers its purpose, that of bringing back to unity the duality posited in God in the preceding clause. The idea contained in the third proposition is thus that of the essential *divinity* of the Word.

To the plenitude of the divine life, therefore, there appertains the existence of a being *eternal* like God, *personal* like Him, *God* like Him; but dependent on Him, aspiring towards Him, living only for Him. And this being it is whom John has recognized in that Jesus whom he knew as the Christ, and who is to be the subject of the following narrative (ver. 14).

We have given to the word Logos the meaning *Word*, and not *reason* which it ordinarily has with the Greek philosophers. This word signifies two things: 1, the reason, as being by its very nature in the line of manifestation; and 2, the word, as the instrument of the reason. But the first of these two meanings is foreign to the N. T. Besides, it is excluded in this passage by the relation to Gen. i. 1. We cannot therefore, as has sometimes been attempted, give to this word here the philosophical sense of divine *reason* and apply it to the consciousness which God has of Himself. *Storr* and others have taken it in the sense of ὁ λέγων, *he who speaks*, the supreme interpreter of the thought of God; others (*Beza*, etc.) in that of ὁ λεγόμενος, *the one announced, the one promised*. These two senses are grammatically inadmissible. *Hofmann* and *Luthardt*, with the desire

[1] *The Prologue of St. John's Gospel* (*Plymouth*).

of removing from John's Prologue every element of philosophical speculation, have taken this word in the sense which the expression *Word of God* ordinarily has in the N. T.: the message of salvation. According to Hofmann, Jesus is thus designated because He is the true subject of all the divine messages; according to Luthardt, as being the personified proclamation, the message and the messenger identified. But what becomes of the allusion to Gen. i. 1, according to these two views? Then, in the following verses the work of creation is spoken of, not that of redemption. Finally, if the term *Word* had this sense, could the proposition of ver. 14: *the Word was made flesh*, be any longer understood? Is it allowable to suppose that John meant thereby: The contents or the agent of the gospel proclamation was made flesh? The fact is that Jesus did not become these contents or this agent except as following upon and by means of the incarnation. The anonymous English writer of whom we spoke, who evidently belongs to a party professing the Unitarian (anti-Trinitarian) doctrine, gives to the word Logos the sense of divine *declaration*. This is, in fact, the divine decree proclaimed as a command which produced the universe (vv. 1–5), then the prophetic revelations (vv. 6–13), finally, the Christian redemption (ver. 14). All personality of Jesus anterior to His earthly appearance is thus eliminated from the text of John. But how, with this sense of the term *Word*, is the *ἦν, was*, of ver. 1 to be explained? The *declaration* of the divine will is not eternal; *ἐγένετο* must have been used, as in ver. 3; since this is an historical fact. No more comprehensible are the second and third propositions of ver. 1. They would signify, according to this view, that the creative command has relation to God (*πρός*), in the sense that the creation is designed to reveal God, and other strange ideas of the same kind. *Beyschlag*, and several others after him, recognized clearly in ver. 1 the idea of the eternity of the Logos; but they deny to this being personality and would see in Him only an abstract principle, pre-existing in the divine understanding, and which is realized in time in the person of Jesus Christ. To this sense the Socinian explanation comes, according to which the Logos pre-existed only in the divine decree; also that of *Ritschl* and his school, which reduces the pre-existence of Christ to the eternal *election* of His person as the agent in the establishment of the kingdom of God on earth. Exegetically speaking, all these explanations come into collision with the second and third propositions of our verse, which, as we have seen, both of them imply the personality of the Logos. They are equally in contradiction to the words of Jesus, reported by our evangelist, from which he has also himself derived the idea formulated in this Prologue,—particularly that of vi. 62: "When ye shall see the Son of man ascending where he was before," viii. 58: "Before Abraham was, I am," xvii. 5: "Restore to me the glory which I had with thee before the world was." Either Jesus used this language or the evangelist ascribed it to Him. In the first case, Jesus gave a false testimony respecting His person, even as the Jews accused Him of doing. In the second, the apostle allowed himself to make Him speak according to his own fancy, and this on a subject of capital importance. For ourselves, we regard both of these suppositions alike morally impossible. *Meyer* has modified the preceding view by supposing that the Logos, essentially impersonal, assumed the character of a person at the moment of creation and for the purpose of performing that act. This view has no basis in the text of the Prologue and none in the rest of the Scriptures. The three *ἦν, was*, of ver. 1 much rather indicate a permanent condition and one identical with itself. Finally, *Neander*

saw in the Logos the organ by which God reveals Himself, as in the Holy Spirit he saw the force by which He communicates Himself. We do not contest the relative truth of this conception; we only find it incomplete. And for this reason: The second proposition of ver. 1 shows us the Logos turned primordially, not *ad extra*, towards the world in order to reveal God, but *ad intra* towards God Himself. The Logos reveals God to the world only after being immersed in God. He interprets in time the revelation of God which he receives or rather which He Himself *is* eternally.

To the divine essence, then, there appertains a being who is for God that which the word is for the thought, that which the face is to the soul. A living reflection of God within, it is He who reveals Him outwardly. This relation implies at once the most intimate personal communion and the most perfect subordination. How can these two facts be reconciled? Only on one condition: That this eternal existence of the Logos is a matter, not of metaphysical necessity, but of the freedom of love. "God is love." Now what He is, He is altogether, freely and essentially. It is the same with the Logos. His existence is a matter of eternal essence, and of free divine will, or, what unites these two ideas, of moral necessity (comp. xvii. 24). It becomes one to remember that word of Christ Himself: "No one knoweth the Father except the Son" (Luke x. 22; Matt. xi. 27), and that other word of the Apostle Paul: "We see now only darkly and as in a mirror; then we shall know as we have been known." (See further the General Considerations on the Prologue, at the end of ver. 18.)

Ver. 2. "*This Word was in the beginning with God.*"—With this Logos which John has in a manner just discovered in eternity, he takes his place at that beginning of time (ver. 1) from which he went backward even to what was before time, and now he comes down the course of the ages, to the end of showing the Logos operating in the history of the world as the organ of God, before the moment when He is Himself to appear on the earth. The pronoun *οὗτος*, *this Logos*, reproduces more particularly the idea of the third proposition of ver. 1: *this Word-God;* but the apostle joins with it that of the first two, in such a way as to resume in this verse the substance of the three propositions of ver. 1, and thus to explain the part of Creator which he is about to ascribe to the Logos in ver. 3. There is, therefore, no contrast in the pronoun *οὗτος* to any other being whatever, as Meyer supposes, and as the translation of Rilliet would indicate: "*It is he who* was . . ." The allusion to the account in Genesis in the words: *with God*, is no less evident here than in ver. 1; comp. Gen. i. 26 (*let us make*, . . . *our* image, . . . *our* likeness).

Ver. 3. "*All things were made through Him, and not one of the things which exist*[1] *was made without Him.*"—The work of creation was the first act of the divine revelation *ad extra*. The preposition *διά*, *through*, does not lower the Logos to the rank of a mere instrument. For this preposition is often applied to God Himself (Rom. xi. 36; Gal. i. 1; Heb. ii. 10). Neverthe-

[1] D, some Fathers and some Gnostics read *ουδεν* (*nothing*), instead of *ουδε εν* (*not even one thing*).—The Gnostics, Heracleon, Ptolemy, etc., the Alex. Fathers, Clem., Orig., as well as C D L It. Vulg., place a period after *εν* and connect *ο γεγονεν* (*that which has been made*) with the following clause.

less it has as its object to reserve the place of God beside and above the Logos. This same relation is explained and more completely developed by Paul, 1 Cor. viii. 6: "We have but one God, the Father *from* whom (ἐκ) are all things, and we are *for* him (εἰς); and one Lord, Jesus Christ, *through* (διά) whom are all things, and we are *through* him." So, then, no being has come into existence without having passed through the intelligence and will of the Logos. But, also, the Logos derives everything from the Father, and refers everything to the Father. This is what is at once indicated by διά, *through*, which leaves room for ἐκ with relation to the Father.—The word πάντα, *all things*, differs from τὰ πάντα all *the* things, in that the second phrase can designate a particular totality which must be determined according to the context (comp. 2 Cor. v. 18), while the first indicates the most unlimited universality.—The term γίνεσθαι, *to become*, forms a contrast with εἶναι, *to be*, in vv. 1, 2; it indicates the passage from nothing to existence, as opposed to eternal existence; comp. the same contrast, viii. 58: Before Abraham became, I *am*.

The second proposition repeats in a negative form the idea which is affirmatively stated in the first. This mode of expression is frequently found in John, especially in the first Epistle; it is intended to exclude any exception. The reading οὐδέν, *nothing*, instead of οὐδὲ ἕν, *not even one thing*, is not sufficiently supported. It is, undoubtedly, connected with the explanation which places a period immediately after this word ἕν (see on ver. 4).—Some modern writers, *Lücke*, *Olshausen*, *de Wette*, *Bäumlein*, suppose that by this expression: *Not even one thing*, John meant to set aside the Platonic idea of eternal matter (ὕλη). But eternal matter would not be a ἕν, *one* thing; it would be the foundation of everything. It is no less arbitrary to claim, as has been claimed, that in this passage the apostle aims to make the world proceed from an eternally pre-existing matter. Where in the text is the slightest trace of such an idea to be found? Far from holding that a blind principle, such as matter, co-operated in the existence of the universe, John means to say, on the contrary, that every existence comes from that intelligent and free being whom he has for this reason designated by the name *Word*. There is not an insect, not a blade of grass, which does not bear the trace of this divine intervention, the seal of this wisdom.—"The foundation of the universe," as Lange says, "is luminous." It is the Word!

We have, in the translation, joined the last words of the Greek phrase: ὃ γέγονεν (*which exists*) to ver. 3, and not, as many interpreters, to ver. 4 (see on that verse). These words seem, it is true, to mak a useless repetition in connection with the verb ἐγένετο (*became*). This apparent repetition has been explained by a redundancy peculiar to the style of John. But it must not be forgotten that the Greek perfect is, in reality, a present, and that the sense of ὃ γέγονεν is consequently, not: nothing of what has *come to be*, has come to be without Him; but nothing of what *subsists*, of what now *is* (γέγονε), came to be (ἐγένετο) without Him. There is here, therefore, neither redundance nor tautology. The apostle here has nothing to do with theological speculation; his aim is practical. He has in

view the redemptive work (ver. 14); he wishes to make it understood that He who is become our Saviour is nothing less than the divine and personal being who was associated with God in the work of creation. But the Word has not been the organ of God simply for bringing all beings from nothing into existence; it is He, also, who, when the world is once created, remains the principle of its conservation, and of its ulterior development, both physical and moral.

Ver. 4: "*In Him there was life,*[1] *and the life was the light of men.*"[2] A large number of authorities join with this verse the words ὃ γέγονεν (*that which subsists*), which we have united with the preceding verse; so already the Gnostic *Heracleon*, then *Origen*, the Syriac versions, the MSS. A C D (ℵ B, have no punctuation), and the Latin Fathers. Several modern editors (*Wetstein*, *Lachmann*, *Westcott*, etc.), do the same. On this view, we can translate in three ways. Either, with Cyril of Alexandria: "That which exists . . . there was life in him" (in that existing being); or: "That which exists in him was living" (placing the comma after αὐτῷ); or finally: "That which exists, had life (was living) in him" (the comma before αὐτῷ). The first meaning is grammatically forced; the thought, moreover, is an idle one. Of the other two constructions, the simplest, the one also which gives the most natural meaning, is certainly the second. For the idea which needs to be determined and explained by the defining words ἐν αὐτῷ (*in him*), is not the subject, *that which subsists*, which is made sufficiently plain by ver. 3, but the predicate *was life*. This last interpretation, however, is also inadmissible. With this meaning, John would have said, not: *was life* (a far too strong expression), but: "*had life* in him." The expression ζωὴν ἔχειν is familiar to him in the sense of participating in life (iii. 15, 16; v. 24; vi. 47, etc.). The words ὃ γέγονεν, therefore, cannot in any way belong to ver. 4; and the subject of the first proposition of this verse is, consequently, the word ζωή, *life*: "Life was in Him." But what meaning is to be given to these words? Must we, with *Weiss*, apply the term *life* to the life of the Logos Himself. The Logos had life, as unceasingly in communication with the Father (ver. 1). But why return to the description of the nature of the Logos, already described in vv. 1, 2, and after His first manifestation, the act of creation, had already been mentioned? Weiss answers that, as vv. 1, 2, had prepared the way for the mentioning of the creative work (ver. 3), ver. 4 returns to the nature of the Logos in order to prepare for that which is about to be said in ver. 5 of His illuminating activity. But this alleged symmetry between ver. 4 and ver. 1 is very forced. There is constant progress, and no going backward. It is an altogether simple course to regard ver. 4 as continuing the description of the *work* of the Logos. The world, after having received *existence* through Him (ver. 3), gained in Him the *life* which it enjoyed. There is here a double gradation: first, from the idea of *existence* to that of *life*, then from "*through* Him" to "*in* Him." Compare an analogous

[1] ℵ D, It. plerique; Syr$^{cur.}$; read εστιν (*there is*), instead of ην (*there was*).

[2] B omits in the text των ανθρωπων (*of men*), afterwards supplied in the margin.

double gradation in Col. i. 16, 17: "All things have been created *through Him* (δι' αὐτοῦ ἔκτισται) . . . ; and they subsist *in Him* (ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκε)." Life, indeed, is more than existence. It is existence saturated with force, existence in its state of normal progress towards the perfect destination of being. And this first gradation is connected with the second: It is *through* the Logos that the world exists; it is *in* intimate relation with Him ("in Him") that it receives the life-giving forces by means of which it subsists and is developed. With the same meaning, *Gess* says: "The creation has not been abandoned by the Logos subsequently to the act of creation; but He penetrated it with forces which were able to make it prosper, make it move onward with success." Some interpreters apply the term *life* here solely to the physical life (*Calvin*, etc.); others, to the spiritual life (*Origen*, *Hengstenberg*, *Weiss*). But this distinction is out of place in this passage. For, as the question in hand is as to what the Logos was for created beings, it follows from this fact that He communicates life to each one of them in a different measure, and in a form appropriate to its aspirations and capacities; to some, physical life only; to others, that life, and besides one or another degree of the higher life, Thus, the want of the article before the word ζωή (*life*), is very fully explained; the purpose being to leave this word in its most unlimited and most variously applicable sense. The reading ἐστι (*is*), instead of ἦν (*was*), in the Sinaitic and Cambridge manuscripts, has been wrongly adopted by Tischendorf, in his eighth edition; it is incompatible with the ἦν of the following clause. It is, undoubtedly, a correction arising from the interpretation of those who connect the words ὃ γέγονε with ver. 4; since this perfect γέγονε, being in sense a present, demands in the verb of the principal clause the present (*is*), and not the imperfect (*was*).

To what moment of history must we refer the fact declared in this proposition? *Hengstenberg* and *Brückner* think that the question is of a purely ideal relation; the first, in this sense: "The Logos *must* one day (at the moment of His incarnation) become the life, that is to say, the salvation of the world;" the second: "The Logos *would have been* the life of the world, had it not been for sin, which has broken the bond between the world and Him." But these two explanations violate the sense of the word *was*, which must express a reality, as well as the *was* in vv. 1, 2.

In the first editions of this Commentary, suffering myself to be guided by the connection between ver. 3 and ver. 4, I referred ver. 4, with *Meyer*, to the time which immediately followed the creation, to that moment of normal opening to life when the Word, no longer meeting any obstacle to His beneficent action in nature and in humanity, poured forth abundantly to every being the riches of life; these words designated thus the paradisaical condition. In this way, ver. 4 answered to Gen. ii., as ver. 3 to Gen. i., and ver. 5 to Gen. iii. (the fall). The two imperfects *was*, in this verse, are in harmony with this view. I am obliged, however, to give up this view now, in consequence of a change which I have felt compelled, since the second edition, to make in my interpretation of ver. 5 (see on that verse). If the 5th verse is referred, as I now refer it, not to the fall

and the condition which followed it, but to the appearance of the Logos at His coming in the flesh, and to the rejection of Him by mankind, the interval between ver. 4 (Paradise) and ver. 5 (the rejection of Christ) would be too considerable to be included in the simple *καί, and,* at the beginning of ver. 5. We must therefore necessarily extend the epoch described in ver. 4 to the whole time which elapsed from the creation (ver. 3) to the coming of Christ (ver. 5). During all that period of the history of humanity, the world subsisted and was developed only by virtue of the life which was communicated to it by the Logos. The Logos was, as *Schaff* says, "the life of every life." Not only all existence, but all force, all enjoyment, all progress in the creation were His gift.

The meaning of the second proposition naturally follows from that which has been given to the first. If, as *Weiss* thinks, the first referred to the life which the Logos possesses in Himself, the second would signify that this same Logos, in so far as He possesses the spiritual life through the perfect knowledge which He has of God, became *the light* of men by communicating it to them. But John does not say in ver. 4 that the Logos was Himself the light of men; he makes the light proceed from *the life* which the Logos communicated to them. And this is the reason why he limits the word *life* in the second proposition by the article: *That* life, which the world received from the Logos become light *in men,* it opened itself in them and in them alone, in virtue of their inborn aptitudes, in the form of light.

Light, with John, is one of those extremely rich expressions which it is difficult accurately to define. It does not designate an exclusively moral idea, *salvation,* as *Hengstenberg* thinks, or *holiness,* the true mode of being, as *Luthardt* says; for in these two senses it could not be sufficiently distinguished from life. No more is it a purely intellectual notion: *reason* (*Calvin, de Wette*), for John could not say, in this sense: *God is light,* (1 Ep. i. 5). In this last passage, John adds: "And there is in him no *darkness.*" If he means by this last term moral evil, the depravity of the will uniting with it the inward falsehood, the darkening of the intelligence which results from it, the light will be, to his thought, moral good, holiness, together with the inward clearness, the general intuition of the truth which arises from a good will; let us say: the distinct consciousness of oneself and of God in the common sphere of good, the possession of the true view-point with respect to all things through uprightness of heart, holiness joyously contemplating its own reality and thereby all truth. This inward light is an emanation of the life, of the life as moral life. Here is the explanation of the objective phrase: *of men;* for men alone, as intelligent and free beings, as moral agents, are capable of the enjoyment of such light. This word would certainly have a very natural application to the primitive state of man in paradise. But it can be extended to the human condition in general, even after the fall. God has continued to reveal to man "the end and the way" (*Gess*). From existence, as it appeared in man, determined by the consciousness of moral obligation, there has sprung up in all times and in all places a certain

light concerning man, concerning his relations with God, concerning God Himself, and concerning the world; comp. as to the Jews vii. 17, and as to the Gentiles x. 16; xi. 52; so also in Paul: Rom. i. 19, 21; 1 Cor. i. 21; Acts xiv. 17. The various forms of worship and the indisputable traces of a certain moral sense, even among peoples the most degraded, are the proofs of this universal light emanating from the Logos. All the rays of the sentiment of the beautiful, the true and the just which have illuminated and which ennoble humanity, justify the expression of John (comp. ver. 10). It is this fundamental truth which was formulated by the Fathers (Justin, Clem. Alex.) in their doctrine of the λόγος σπερματικός. There is nothing more contrary to the idea of an original dualism which *Baur* and his school ascribe to John, than this expression: *of men*, which embraces all humanity without any distinction.

SECOND SECTION.

Unbelief. I., 5–11.

This Logos, light of the world, appears in the world buried in the darkness of sin; He is not recognized and is rejected (ver. 5). And yet God had taken all precautions to prevent such a result (vv. 6–8). But the impossible is realized (vv. 9–11).

Ver. 5: "*And the light shines in the darkness, and the darkness apprehended it not.*"[1]—What, then, is this *darkness* (σκοτία) which all at once fills the scene of the world created and enlightened by the Word? It is impossible, with some interpreters of Baur's school, to think of eternal darkness, of a kingdom of evil co-eternal with that of good. Ver. 3 is positively opposed to this: everything that is, without exception, is the work of the Logos. But John, as vv. 3, 4 have proved, wrote for readers who were acquainted with the account in Genesis. We must also explain ver. 5 according to this account. The darkness of which the evangelist speaks is the subjection to sin and falsehood in which humanity lives in consequence of the fact of the fall, narrated in Gen. iii. As the Logos was the principle of life and light for the world, moral obscurity invaded it, as soon as humanity had ceased to live *in Him* (ver. 3); there was *darkness*. The Logos, however, none the less perseveres in His office of illuminator (ver. 4), and He ends by appearing Himself on this theatre which He has never ceased to enlighten. Formerly, I referred the present φαίνει, *it shines*, to the beneficent action of the Logos before His incarnation: this is the thought which I have just shown to be contained in the second clause of ver. 4. This view approaches the explanation of *de Wette*, who refers the φαίνει, *shines*, to the revelations of the O. T., and that of the interpreters who apply it to the moral light granted to the heathen by means of reason and conscience. Three reasons have made me give up this explanation: 1. The present φαίνει, *shines*, is only naturally explained, especially in con-

[1] B and 5 Mnn. read αυτον (the Logos) instead of αυτο (the light).

trast to the two past tenses of ver. 4, if we refer it to a present fact; now this fact contemporaneous with the moment when the evangelist writes can only be the earthly appearance of Christ and of the Gospel proclamation which perpetuates the glory of it here on earth. 2. The very striking parallel passage, 1 Ep. ii. 8: "Because the darkness is passing away, and the true light already shineth" (ἤδη φαίνει), can apply only, according to the context, to the Gospel era, and it thus determines the meaning of the same expression in the Prologue. 3. The truly decisive reason, to my view, is the significant *asyndeton* between ver. 5 and ver. 6. The absence of a logical particle most frequently indicates, in Greek, a more emphatic and more developed reaffirmation of the thought already expressed. Now, it does not appear to me possible to interpret otherwise this form of expression in this passage. The historical fact so abruptly introduced in ver. 6 by the words: "There appeared a man . . . . ," can only be thus mentioned with the design of giving through history the proof of the thought declared in ver. 5; and as the development which opens at ver. 6 and closes in ver. 11 relates wholly to the rejection of Christ by Israel, it follows that the second part of ver. 5, the theme of this development, can only relate to this same fact. Thus the φαίνει, *shines*, is understood by *Ewald, Hengstenberg, Luthardt, Weiss.* Some interpreters think that the act of *shining* can apply to the action of the Logos alike *before* and *during* His earthly life; so *Olshausen, Meyer, Westcott*,—the last writer extending the meaning of the present *shines* from the moment of the creation even to the consummation of things. But the two modes of illumination, internal and external, which would be thus attributed to the Logos here, are of too heterogeneous a nature to make it possible to unite them in the same term. We have, moreover, already seen that the present *shines* cannot naturally apply to the time which preceded the incarnation.

The καί, *and*, simply indicates the calm continuity of the work of the Logos throughout these different stages; the office which He accomplished in the depths of the human soul (ver. 4) has ended in that which He has just accomplished as Messiah in the midst of the Jewish people (vv. 5–11). *Weiss* and *Gess* object to this explanation, that it forces us to give to the word τὸ φῶς, *the light*, a different sense in ver. 4 and ver. 5: there, the light as a *gift* of the Logos; here, the light as being the Logos Himself. But in ver. 4 the question is of a light emanating from the life, and consequently impersonal, while in ver. 5, John speaks of the light as visibly and personally present. This, then, is his meaning: that that moral good the ideal of which the Logos caused to shine in the human soul, He has come to realize in Himself here on earth, and thus to display it in all its brightness (ver. 5). John uses this notion of light with great freedom. We find the same two senses united in the same verse in viii. 12: "I *am* the light of the world"—this is the sense of the light in our ver. 5—and "He that followeth me shall have the light of life"—this is the sense of the word in ver. 4. The active form φαίνει, *shines*, is purposely employed rather than the middle φαίνεται, which would signify: *appears*, shows itself. John means, not that it has appeared, but that from this time forward it

pours forth its brilliancy in the darkness of humanity, striving to dissipate the darkness.

The second part of ver. 5 is explained in two opposite ways, according to the two opposite meanings which are given to the verb, *κατέλαβεν*. This verb, which signifies to lay hands on, to seize, may denote a hostile act: to seize in order to restrain, to overcome, or a friendly act: to seize in order to appropriate to oneself, to possess. The first of these meanings is that which the ancient Greek interpreters (*Origen*, *Chrysostom*, etc.), adopt: for a long time abandoned, it is now again preferred by some modern writers (*Lange*, *Weiss*, *Westcott*); "And the darkness did not succeed in restraining, in extinguishing this light." In favor of this meaning the expression in xii. 35 is cited: "Walk while you have the light, lest the darkness *overtake* you (*καταλάβῃ* in the hostile sense)." But even in that passage, the meaning of this verb is not *overcome;* Jesus speaks of the night, not as *restraining* the day, but as *overtaking* the traveler who started on his journey too late. This single example which is cited, therefore, is not really one. Besides, this meaning is excluded by the context when properly understood. We have seen that the *asyndeton* between vv. 5 and 6, implies a very close relation of thought between them. Now, this relation exists only as ver. 5 states a fact which already refers, like all that which follows, to the development of unbelief, not of faith. This it is which prevents us from translating: "and the darkness did not restrain it." In order to find in what follows the evidence of a similar idea, we must pass beyond the entire development of vv. 6–11, and proceed to discover it in the fact mentioned in vv. 12, 13: "To all those who received him . . .;" which is, of course, impossible, and the more so as ver. 12 is connected with ver. 11 by the adversative particle *δέ*. Besides, if the apostle wished to express the idea which is attributed to him, he had for this purpose the very natural word *κατέχειν*, to check, to repress: comp. Rom i. 18. It is fitting, therefore, to apply to the word here the other meaning which is the prevailing one throughout the whole New Testament. Comp. Phil. iii. 12, 13 (to attain the end); 1 Cor. ix. 24 (to lay hold of the prize); Rom. ix. 30 (to obtain the righteousness of faith). In the same sense it is also used in Sirach xv. 1–7: *καταλαμβάνειν σοφίαν* (to attain to wisdom). I lay stress only on the passages where the verb is used, as it is here, in the active. The sense of *comprehend* in which it is taken in the middle (Acts iv. 13; x. 34; Eph. iii. 18) rests also on the meaning of the verb which we here adopt. John means, accordingly, that the darkness did not suffer itself to be penetrated by the light which was shining in order to dissipate it. To understand this somewhat strange figure, we must recall to mind the fact that the word *darkness* here denotes, not an abstract principle, but living and free beings, corrupted humanity. Understood in this sense, this second proposition is the summary statement which is developed in the following passage, vv. 6–11; it has its counterpart in the second proposition of ver. 11. The choice of the slightly different term *παρέλαβεν received* (ver. 11), in order to express nearly the same idea as *κατέλαβεν* of ver. 5, will be easily explained. The *καί, and*, which joins this proposition

to the preceding one, takes the place, as is often the case, of a δέ, *but.* John presents the course of things, not from the point of view of the changing conduct of mankind towards God, but from that of the faithful and persevering conduct of the Logos towards mankind. The aorist κατέλαβεν stands out in relief on the general basis of the present φαίνει, as a particular and unique act, an attitude taken once for all. To the view of the evangelist, the refusal of the mass of mankind to allow themselves to be enlightened by the Gospel is already an accomplished fact. Comp. the saying of Jesus in iii. 19, which is, as it were, the text from which are derived the present words: "The light is come into the world, and men *loved* the darkness *rather* than the light, because their works were evil." The apostle passes now to the account of the manner in which this decisive moral fact stated in ver. 5 was accomplished and how it was consummated in Israel. And that he may make the gravity of it thoroughly apprehended, he begins by calling to mind the extraordinary means which God adopted, in order, as it would seem, to render it impossible, vv. 6–8.

Ver. 6. "*There appeared a man sent from God; his name was John.*"—The forerunner is not mentioned here as representing, either the whole of the Jewish economy, or prophetism in particular, as is thought by the interpreters who endeavor to find an historical plan in the Prologue. The apostle speaks of the forerunner only with respect to his personality and from the point of view of his relation to that of the Saviour.—The mention of the forerunner in this place with such particularity is, as *Weiss* observes, characteristic of the Apostle John, to whom the Baptist had served as a guide to conduct him to Christ.—The word ἐγένετο, *became, appeared,* points to an historical fact, and might thus form a contrast with the verbs ἦν, *was,* which in ver. 1 designated the eternal existence of the Word; but between them the two ἦν of ver. 4 have intervened. The word ἄνθρωπος, *a man,* might also be the antithesis to the divine subject who has alone been brought forward up to this point; yet there is nothing which indicates this with sufficient positiveness.—The analytic form ἐγένετο ἀπεσταλμένος sets forth the importance of the person of John in a better way than the simple ἀπεστάλη, which would have reference only to his mission. He was the first prophetic person raised up by God since a time long past. On the word *sent,* comp. iii. 28: "Because I am *sent* before him," as well as Mal. iii. 1, from which passage this expression is certainly drawn. The name John (*God shows grace*) marked the character of the era which was about to open. Yet it is not for this reason that the evangelist mentions the name here. He means simply to say: "This man, of whom I speak to you, is the one who is known by you all under the name of John." It is remarkable that our evangelist uses simply the name John, without adding the epithet *Baptist,* which had early become inseparable from this name, as we see from the Synoptics, and even from the Jewish historian, Josephus.[1] Does not Meyer reasonably conclude from this omission (Introd. p. 31), that the author of our Gospel must have known the forerun-

[1] "John surnamed the Baptist." *Antiq.* xviii. 5, 2.

ner otherwise than through the general tradition of the Church? If he had really known him before the public voice had given him this title, it was very natural that he should designate him simply by his name. *Credner* thought that, inasmuch as the title *Baptist* served in the Church to distinguish the forerunner from another person of the same name (John the apostle), the latter omitted the title in order that he might not attract attention to himself by the contrast; an ingenious observation, but, perhaps, less well-founded than the preceding. After having introduced this personage, the author describes his role:

Ver. 7. "*This one came as a witness, to bear witness to the light, that all might believe through him.*"—The pronoun οὗτος, *this one*, sums up all the statements of the preceding verse, as οὗτος of ver. 2 summed up all those of ver. 1. The verb ἦλθε, *came*, indicates a more advanced step than the ἐγένετο, *appeared*, of ver. 6; the entrance of John upon his public activity. —This character of witness has such importance, in the view of the evangelist, that he presents it, the first time, without an object: as a *witness* or (more literally), *for testimony;* the second time, with an indication of the object of the testimony. The first expression makes prominent the *quality* of witness in itself (in contrast to the superior dignity of the personage who is to follow). The second completes the idea of this testimony.

This idea of *testimony* is one of the fundamental notions of our Gospel. It is correlative to and inseparable from that of faith. Testimony is given only with a view to faith, and faith is impossible except by means of testimony. The only faith worthy of the name is that which fastens itself upon a divine testimony given either in act or in word. Testimony resembles the vigorous trunk of the oak; faith, the slender twig which embraces this trunk and makes it its support. But did the light need to be attested, pointed out? Does not the sun give its own proof of itself? Certainly, if the Word had appeared here below in the glory which belongs to Him (*the form of God*, Phil. ii. 6), the sending of a witness would not have been necessary. But He was obliged to appear enveloped in a thick veil (*the flesh*, ver. 14); and, in the condition of blindness into which sin had plunged man (ver. 5, *the darkness*), he could not recognize Him except with the help of a testimony. The evangelist adds: *That all might believe through him;* evidently: Believe on Christ through John, and not on God through Christ, as *Grotius* and *Ewald* thought. The question in this verse is not of the office of Christ, but of that of John. When the critics of Baur's school charge our author with setting up, in agreement with the Gnostics, two kinds of men, of opposite origins and destinies, the psychical and the pneumatical, they seem to be forgetful of these words: "That *all* might believe through him."—We find here a new indication of the part which the forerunner had played in the development of the writer's own faith. To the affirmation of the fact, John adds, as in ver. 3, a negative proposition, designed to exclude every opposite idea.

Ver. 8. "*He was not the light; but* [*he came*] *to bear witness to the light.*"—The emphasis is not, as *Meyer* and *Weiss* think, on the verbal idea, *was*, but on the subject *He*, in contrast with the other personage (ver. 9).

Hence the choice of the pronoun ἐκεῖνος, which has always with John a strongly emphatic and even oftentimes exclusive sense. It is in vain, as it seems to me, that *Weiss* denies this special use of the pronoun ἐκεῖνος in our Gospel. In a multitude of cases, this commentator is obliged to have recourse to veritable feats of skill in order to maintain that this pronoun always designates a subject or an object which is *more remote*, in opposition to one that is nearer; comp. e. g. i. 40; v. 39; vii. 45, and many other passages which we shall notice, and where the sense which is claimed by Weiss is not applicable. The ἵνα, *in order that*, depends, according to *Meyer* and *Weiss*, on an ἦλθε (*came*) understood, or it is even, according to *Luthardt*, independent of any verb, as often in John (ix. 3; xiii. 18; xv. 25). But this independence can never be other than apparent; a purpose must always depend on some action. And it is unnatural to go very far in search of the verb ἦλθε, *came*, while the verb ἦν, *was*, can easily take the sense of "was *there*" (*aderat*) and serve as a point of support for the *in order that;* comp. vii. 39, where Weiss himself renders ἦν by *aderat*.

It appears to me scarcely admissible that by this remark John desires simply to set forth the absolute superiority of Jesus to John the Baptist, (*Meyer*, *Hengstenberg*); or that, as *Weiss* thinks, we have here again a point merely describing the experience of the author himself as an old disciple of the forerunner. The negative form is too emphatic to be explained thus, and the analogous passages i. 20; iii. 25 ff., compared with Acts xiii. 25, and with the remarkable fact related in Acts xix. 3, 4, lead us rather to suppose a polemic design in opposition to persons who attributed to the forerunner the dignity of Messiah (comp. *Introd.* pp. 213, 214).

The testimony of John should have opened the door of faith to all, and rendered unbelief impossible. And yet the impossibility is realized, and even under the most monstrous form. This is what is developed in vv. 9–11.

Ver. 9. "*The true light, which enlightens every man, came into the world.*" I think I must positively decide for this interpretation, making the participle ἐρχόμενον, *coming*, the predicate of the verb ἦν, *was: was coming*, for: *came*. This analytic form implies an idea of continuance. At the moment when John bore witness of the light, it was in course of coming; it was properly coming; thus *Bengel*, *Lücke*, *de Wette*, *Weiss*, *Westcott*. This verse, thus understood, leaves to the expression *to come into the world* the ordinary, and in some sort technical, sense which it has in John (iii. 19; vi. 14; ix. 39; xviii. 37, etc.). Some interpreters, while adopting the same construction, refer this term: *came into the world* to the long coming of the Logos through the ages, by means of His revelations during the whole course of the Old Covenant (*Keim*, *Westcott*). But this sense would lead, as we shall see, to a tautology with the first proposition of the following verse. Other meanings given to ἦν ἐρχόμενον by *Tholuck:* "He was going to come," and by *Luthardt*, "He was to come," are hardly natural. *Meyer*, with some ancient and modern interpreters (*Origen*, *Chrysostom*, *Augustine*, *Calvin*, *Beza*, *etc.*), adopts an entirely different construction; he joins the ἐρχόμενον with the substantive ἄνθρωπον: "which

enlightens *every man coming into the world.*" In this case τὸ φῶς, *the light*, is taken as the subject of ἦν, which is translated in the sense of *aderat* "was present." "The true light, which enlightens every man coming into the world, was present;" or τὸ φῶς is made the predicate of ἦν, by giving to this verb as its subject a φῶς to be supplied from the preceding verse: "This light (to which John bore witness, ver. 8) was the true light which enlightens every man coming into the world." The uselessness of this appended phrase, which is self-evident, has been often alleged against this connection of ἐρχόμενον, *coming*, with the substantive *every man;* but wrongly, as I showed in my first edition, where I adopted this explanation. For these words thus understood would signify that the light of the Logos is a divine gift which every man brings with him when he is born, —that the matter in question is, accordingly, an innate light. This idea, however, is not lost in the other construction; it is still found in the words: *which enlightens every man.* The two constructions of ἦν, either in the sense of *was present*, or by supplying with it a subject derived from the preceding verse, are not very natural. Finally, the logical connection with ver. 8 is closer with the first meaning: John came to testify of the light (ver. 8): for at that very moment it was on the point of appearing in the world (ver. 9). In my second edition, I attempted a third, or even a fourth construction, by attaching the participle ἐρχόμενον, not to ἦν, nor to ἄνθρωπον, but to φωτίζει, *to enlighten*, making it a sort of Latin gerundive: "which *enlightens* every man *by coming* (itself) into the world." But this use of the participle can scarcely be justified by sufficient examples.

The word ἀληθινός, *veritable*, appears here for the first time. It is one of the characteristic terms of John's style. Of twenty-eight passages in which we meet with it in the N. T., twenty-three belong to John, nine in the Gospel, four in the first Epistle, and ten in the Apocalypse (*Milligan*). It is also used in the classics. It designates the fact as the adequate realization of the idea. It contrasts, therefore, not the true with the false, but the normal appearance with the imperfect realization. The light of which John speaks, consequently, is characterized by it as the *essential* light, in opposition to every light of an inferior order. The expression: *which enlightens every man*, if applied to the Gospel revelation, would designate the universalistic character of the Gospel; the present *enlightens* would be that of the idea. It is more natural, however, to find here again the notion which was expressed in ver. 4: the Logos, as the internal light, enlightening every man, illuminating him by the sublime intuitions of the good, the beautiful and the true. The term *every man* gives again a formal contradiction to the assertion of Baur's school which makes John a dualistic philosopher.

The Logos when coming into the world did not arrive there as a stranger. By profound and intimate relations with humanity, He had prepared for His advent here on earth, and seemed to be assured of a favorable reception:

Ver. 10. "*He was in the world and the world had been made by Him, and the world knew Him not.*" A contrast is evidently intended between the

first words of this verse and the last words of ver. 9. This contrast is the occasion of the *asyndeton*. "The Logos came into the world" (ver. 9); "and *yet* he had long been there" (ver. 10 a); "and also the world was His work" (ver. 10 b). The first two propositions set forth that which is incredible, apparently impossible, in the result which is stated in the third (10 c): "and the world did not know him." *Weiss* regards the *being in the world* (10 a) as the consequence of *coming into the world* indicated in ver. 9. But the *asyndeton* between the two verses 9 and 10 does not suit this logical relation (see *Keil*); and, in this case, to what fact does the expression: "He was in the world" refer? It must necessarily be to a fact posterior to the birth of Jesus. This is held, indeed, by *de Wette, Meyer, Astié, Weiss*, and others; they apply the first proposition (10 a) to the presence of Jesus *in Israel* at the moment when John the Baptist was carrying on his ministry, and the third (10 c) to the ignorance in which the Jews still were at that moment of the fact—so important—of the presence of the Messiah; so, in the same sense, where John himself says to them (ver. 26): "There is present in the midst of you *one whom you do not know*." I do not believe it possible to suggest a more inadmissible interpretation. In the first place, that ignorance in which the people then were with regard to the presence of the Messiah had nothing reprehensible in it, since this presence had not yet been disclosed to them by the forerunner; it could not therefore be the ground of the tone of reproach which attaches to this solemn phrase: "And the world knew him not!" Then, the imperfect would have been necessary: "And the world *was not knowing* him," and not the aorist, which denotes an accomplished and definite fact. Moreover, it would be necessary to give to the word *world* an infinitely narrower meaning than in the preceding clause, where it was said: "and the world (the universe) had been made by him." Finally, how are we to justify the juxtaposition of two facts so heterogeneous as that of the creation of the world by the Word (10 b) and that of His presence, then momentarily unknown, in Israel! There is no harmony between the three clauses of this verse except by referring the first and the third to facts which are no less cosmic and universal than that of the creation of the world, mentioned in the second. This is the reason why we do not hesitate to refer the first to the presence and action of the Logos in humanity before His coming in the flesh, and the third to the criminal want of understanding in humanity, which, in its entirety, failed to recognize in Christ the Logos, its creator and illuminator, who had appeared in its midst. This return backward to that which the Logos is for the universe (comp. ver. 3), and especially for man (comp. ver. 4), is intended to make conspicuous the unnatural character of the rejection of which He was the object here on earth. The world was His work, bearing the stamp of His intelligence, as the master-piece bears the stamp of the genius of the artist who has conceived and executed it; He was filling it with His invisible presence, and especially with the moral light with which He was enlightening the human soul . . . and behold, when He appears, this world created and enlightened by Him did not recognize

Him! One might be tempted to apply the words: "*did not know him*," to the fact indicated in Rom. i. 21–23; Acts xiv. 16; xvii. 30; 1 Cor. i. 21, the voluntary ignorance of the *heathen* world with respect to God as revealed in nature and conscience. In that case we should be obliged to translate: "*had not* known him," and to see in this sin of the heathen world the prelude to that of the Jewish world, indicated in the following verse. But the non-recognition and rejection of the Logos *as such* cannot be made a reproach to the world before His personal incarnation in Jesus Christ. The matter in question, then, is the rejection of the Logos in His earthly appearance. This general and cosmic rejection was already regarded by Jesus as a consummated fact in the time of His ministry (iii. 19; xv. 18); how much more must it have seemed so at the moment when John was writing! The Church formed among mankind only an imperceptible minority, and this proportion between the true believers and the unbelievers has remained the same in all times and in all places.

The masculine pronoun *αὐτόν*, *him*, refers to the neuter term *τὸ φῶς*, *the light*, which proves that *αὐτοῦ* also must be taken as masculine. This grammatical anomaly arises from the fact that the apostle has now in view the light in so far as it had personally appeared in Jesus. This is, likewise, the reason why he substitutes the word *ἔγνω knew*, for *κατέλαβε laid hold of* (ver. 5), although the idea is fundamentally the same. One *lays hold of* a principle, one *recognizes* a person.

The failure to recognize the Logos as He appeared in Jesus is stated at first, in the third proposition of ver. 10, in an abstract and summary way as a general fact. Then, the fact is described in ver. 11 under the form of its most striking historical and concrete realization.

Ver. 11. "*He came to His own and they that were His own received Him not.*" A relation of gradation might be established between this verse and the preceding, if this verse were applied to the rejection of the natural revelation by the heathen: "And there was something still worse!" But the *asyndeton* is unfavorable to this sense, which we have already refuted. It leads us rather to find here a more emphatic reaffirmation of the fact indicated in ver. 10: "The world did not know Him." Yes; that rejection took place, and where it seemed the most impossible—in the dwelling-place which the Logos had prepared for Himself here below! The words *His home*, *His own*, by setting forth the enormity of the Jewish crime, characterize it as the climax of the sin of humanity. The word *ἦλθε*, *came*, refers to the public ministry of Jesus in Israel. *Τὰ ἴδια*, literally: *His home* (comp. xix. 27). Before coming to the earth, the Logos prepared for Himself there a dwelling-place which peculiarly belonged to Him, and which should have served Him as a door of entrance to the rest of the world. Comp. Ex. xix. 5, where Jehovah says to the Jews: "*You shall be my property among all peoples*," and Ps. cxxxv. 4: "*The Lord hath chosen Jacob for Himself.*" Malachi had said of Jehovah, in describing the Messianic advent as His last appearance: "And the Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come *to His temple;* behold, he cometh" (iii. 1). But this

door was closed to Him, and even by those who should have opened it to Him: οἱ ἴδιοι, *His own*, His servants, the dwellers in His house, which He had Himself established. In the same way as τὰ ἴδια *His home* designates Canaan together with the entire theocratic institution, οἱ ἴδιοι, *His own*, designates all the members of the Israelitish nation. Paul also calls them οἰκεῖοι, *members of the household, domestici, familiares*, in contrast with ξένοι and πάροικοι, strangers and sojourners. Never, it seems, had the Jews better deserved that title of honor from Jehovah, "His people," than at the moment when Jesus appeared. Their monotheistic zeal and their aversion to idolatry had reached at that epoch the culminating point. The nation in general seemed to form a Messianic community altogether disposed to receive "Him who should come," as a bride welcomes her bridegroom. The word παραλαμβάνειν, *receive to oneself* (xiv. 3), well expresses the nature of the eager welcome which the Messiah had a right to expect. That welcome should have been a solemn and official reception on the part of the whole nation hailing its Messiah and rendering homage to its God. If the home prepared had opened itself in this way, it would have become the centre for the conquest of the world. Instead of this, an unheard of event occurred. Agamemnon returning to his palace and falling by the stroke of his faithless spouse—this was the tragic event *par excellence* of pagan history. What was that crime in comparison with the theocratic tragedy! The God invoked by the chosen nation appears in His temple, and He is crucified by His own worshipers. Notice the finely shaded difference between the two compound verbs, καταλαμβάνειν, *to apprehend*, ver. 5, which corresponds with *the light* as a principle, and παραλαμβάνειν, *to welcome*, which characterizes the reception given to the master of the house. Respecting the καί, *and*, the same observation as in vv. 5 and 10. The writer has reached the point of contemplating with calmness the poignant contrast which the two facts indicated in the two propositions of this verse present.

Two explanations opposed to that which we have just been developing have been offered. Some interpreters, *Lange*, for example, refer the *coming* of the Word indicated in this verse, to the manifestations of Jehovah and the prophetic revelations in the Old Testament. Others, as Reuss, while applying the words "*He came*," just as we do, to the historical appearing of Jesus Christ, think that the ἴδιοι, *His own*, are not the Jews, but "men in general, as creatures of the pre-existent Word" (*Hist. de la théol. chrét. t.* II., p. 476). Reuss even describes the application of the words τὰ ἴδια, οἱ ἴδιοι, to the Jews, as "a strange error of the ordinary exegesis." He is, however, less positive in his last work; he merely says: "An interpretation *may be maintained* according to which there is no question here of the Jews. So far as the first view is concerned, it is excluded by the word ἦλθε, *He came*, which can only designate, like the same word in ver. 7, an historical fact, the coming of Christ in the flesh. We shall see, moreover, that the following verses cannot be applied to the time of the Old Covenant, as must be the case according to the sense which Lange gives to ver. 11. Reuss' interpretation seems to him to be required,

first, by a difficulty which he finds in the ὅσοι, *all those who*, of ver. 12, if by *His own*, of ver. 11, the Jews are to be understood—we shall examine this objection in its proper place—and then, by the general fact that, according to our Gospel, "there are no special relations between the Word and the Jews as such." We believe that we can prove, on the contrary, that the fourth Gospel, no less than the first, establishes from the beginning to the end an organic relation between the theocracy and the coming of Christ in the flesh. The following are some of the principal passages which do not allow us to question this: ii. 16, "The house *of my Father;*" iv. 22, "Salvation is from *the Jews;*" v. 39, "The scriptures *bear witness of me;*" v. 45–47; viii. 35, 56; x. 2, 3; xii. 41; xix. 36, 37. All these sayings are incompatible with the thought of Reuss and prove that the expressions *His abode*, *His own*, are perfectly applicable to the land of Israel and the ancient people of God.

THIRD SECTION.

Faith, I. 12–18.

The appearance of the Word, therefore, did not succeed in scattering the darkness of mankind and overcoming the resistance of Israel as a nation. Nevertheless, His mission could not fail. At the moment when the people which He had prepared for Himself turns away from Him, a family of believers, divinely begotten, appears and clusters about Him. This is the contrast pointed out by vv. 12 and 13. Ver. 14a explains the regenerating power of this faith: it is that its object is nothing less than the absolutely unique fact of the incarnation of the Word. And the sequel proves that this fact, wonderful as it is, is nevertheless *certain;* certain, because He was beheld with rapture by *eye-witnesses*, to whose number the author belongs (ver. 14b); —certain, because He was pointed out by a *divine herald*, who had received the mission to proclaim Him (ver. 15); certain, because He is an object of experience for the *whole Church*, which through all the heavenly gifts which it receives from this unique man, called Jesus Christ, verifies in Him all the characteristics of the Divine Logos (vv. 16–18). This triple testimony of eye-witnesses, of the official witness, and of the Church itself is the immovable foundation of faith. This third part of the Prologue, then, is indeed the demonstration of the certainty and the riches of faith. The majority of the commentators make this third part begin only at ver. 14, with the words: "And the Word was made flesh." But this way of separating the sections has two serious difficulties: 1, vv. 12, 13 become a dragging appendage to the preceding section into which they do not enter logically, since the dominant idea of that section is the unbelief which the Logos encountered here on earth; and 2, this third mention of the coming of the Word (comp. vv. 5 and 11), not having any introduction, has somewhat of an abrupt and accidental character. It is quite otherwise when vv. 12, 13 are joined with the following section, which treats of faith. They form the antithe-

sis to ver. 11 and thus the transition from the first to the second section of the Prologue. Thus the third and principal mention of the fact of the incarnation is occasioned by the expression of the idea of faith in vv. 12, 13.

Ver. 12. *But,*[1] *to all those who received Him, to them He gave the power of becoming children of God, to those who believe on His name.*—Δέ, *but,* expresses not merely a gradation, but an opposition. This is confirmed by the antithesis of the verb ἔλαβον, *received,* to οὐ παρέλαβον, *did not welcome* (ver. 11); as well as by that of the subject ὅσοι (literally, *as many as there are who*), to οἱ ἴδιοι, *His own* (ver. 11). This last term designated the nation as a body; the pronoun ὅσοι indicates only individuals. By its official representatives, the nation, as such, refused to welcome Jesus; from that moment faith took on the character of a purely individual and, so to speak, sporadic act. This is expressed by the pronoun ὅσοι, *all those who.* But the ὅσοι are not, therefore, only the few members of the Jewish people who did not share the national unbelief; they are *all believers* (τοῖς πιστεύουσιν ver. 12b), whether Jews or Greeks, whom John contemplates as united into one family of the children of God (ἡμεῖς πάντες, *we all,* ver. 16). Reuss (*Hist. de la théol. chrêt.* t. ii., p. 475) thinks that if the term *His own* (ver. 11), designates the Jews, and not men in general, we must also conclude from this fact that the believing ὅσοι are only Jews. But John does not say ὅσοι ἐξ αὐτῶν, all those *from among them,* but: *all those who,* in general. When the Messiah is once rejected by unbelieving Israel, there is henceforth only *humanity,* and in it *individual* believers or unbelievers. This substitution of individual faith for the collective and national welcome of the chosen people, which was wanting, is precisely that which occasions, in this verse, the use of the simple verb ἔλαβον, *received,* instead of the compound παρέλαβον, *welcomed* (ver. 11). The compound had in it something grave and solemn, which was suited to an official reception, such as the Israelitish authorities should have given in the name of the entire theocratic nation joyously introducing its divine King into His palace, the temple at Jerusalem; while the simple λαμβάνειν, which signifies *to take,* to seize in passing and, as it were, accidentally, is perfectly apposite to the notion of individual faith. In this verse, therefore, John substitutes, in the same manner as St. Paul does in all his epistles, the great idea of Christian individualism, with its universal and human character, for Jewish nationalism, with the narrow particularism in which it remained confined. By marking the contrast (δέ, *but*) between the unbelief of the Israelite nation and the faith of individual believers, whoever they may be, Jews or heathen, the apostle would succeed in making the greatness of the blessings understood of which the rebellious people were deprived, although they had been called first of all to enjoy them. Through rejecting the Word, they were deprived of a participation in the life of God which He brought in Himself. In fact, this divine guest, the Logos, conferred on those who received Him

[1] Δέ is omitted by D and some Fathers.

two privileges worthy of Himself: first, a new position in relation to God, and then, by reason of this position, the power to participate in His divine life.

The word ἐξουσία, *authority, competency*, denotes more than a simple possibility, and less than a power properly so called. What is meant is a new position, that of being reconciled, justified, which the believer gains through faith, and through this it is that he receives the power of asking for and receiving the Holy Spirit, by means of which he becomes *a child of God*. The expression τέκνον θεοῦ (*child of God*), which is used by John, includes more than υἱός (*son*), which is used by Paul. The meaning of this latter word does not go beyond the idea of *adoption* (υἱοθεσία), the right of sonship which is accorded to the believer, while the word τέκνον (*child*), from τίκτειν (*to beget*), implies the real communication of the divine life. Comp. Gal. iv. 6: "*Because ye are sons, God sent forth the Spirit of His Son into your hearts;*" a sentence which is equivalent to saying: "Because you are *sons* (υἱοί)—by adoption—God has made you *children* (τέκνα) by regeneration." This ὅτι (*because*), of Paul, expresses precisely the relation of the idea contained in the word ἐξουσία in John. How can Hilgenfeld venture, in the face of the word γενέσθαι (*become*), to impute to John the dualistic system, according to which the children of God are such by nature, and before all faith in the historical Christ!

The idea of *child of God*, in the concrete sense in which it here appears, is foreign to the Old Testament. The words *father* and *child*, in the rare cases in which they are there employed (Ps. ciii. 13; Is. lxiii. 16; Jer. xxxi. 20; Hos. xi. 1), express only the sentiments of affection, tenderness, compassion. This observation is sufficient to set aside the opinion of the interpreters, who, like Lange, with the purpose of reserving the idea of the incarnation for ver. 14, refer these verses 12 and 13 to the faithful ones of the Old Covenant. The expressions *receive the Word* and *become children of God* are far too strong to be applied to the Israelitish saints and would be in flagrant contradiction to the declaration of Jesus (Matt. xi. 11, 12); and to the reflections of John himself (i. 17 and vii. 39).

The figurative, and consequently, somewhat vague, term *receive*, required to be explained, precisely defined; for the readers must know accurately the means by which they may place themselves among the number of the ὅσοι (*all those who*). Hence the appended phrase: τοῖς πιστεύουσιν . . . , (*to those who believe on His name*). *To believe*—this is the means of the λαμβάνειν, the mode of this individual reception. Only, instead of connecting this explanation with the verb, *they received*, the author unites it with the persons of the ὅσοι (*to those who*). "It is one of the peculiarities of John's style," *Luthardt* observes, to define the moral condition by means of which an act is accomplished, by an explanatory appendix added to one of the words which depend on the principal verb. As a point of style, this is perhaps heavy; but as an expression of thought, it is forcible. See the same construction in iii. 13; v. 18; vii. 50, etc. We have sought to give the force of this turn in the translation. The relation between these two acts, *to receive* and *to believe*, is a close one; the first is accomplished by the

very fact of the second. But why, then, is an act of faith necessary for the reception of the Word? Because His divine character is hidden from sight by the veil of the flesh which envelops it. It can only be discerned, therefore, by a perception of a moral nature. Made attentive by the testimony, the man fixes his gaze upon Christ, and, discerning in Him the divine stamp of holiness, he surrenders himself personally to Him. This is faith.

The object of faith, as here indicated, is not the Logos; it is *His name*. *The name*, the normal name of the being, is the true expression of His essence, the perfect revelation of His peculiar character. This name is thus the means which other beings have of knowing Him, of forming their idea of His person. Hence it is that this *idea* is sometimes called *the name*, in a relative and secondary sense, as in the prayer: *Hallowed be thy name.* In our passage, John means: those who believe in the revelation which He has given of Himself, as Logos, who have discerned under the veil of the flesh the manifestation of that divine being, the *only-begotten Son* (vv. 14, 18), and have, because of this perception, surrendered themselves to Him. After having thus explained the term *received*, the apostle develops in ver. 13 the idea of the expression *children of God.*

Ver. 13. "*Who were born*,[1] *not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.*" It seems, at the first glance—because of the past verb: *who were born*—that the apostle places regeneration before faith, which is, of course, impossible. But, as *Meyer* rightly observes, the relative οἵ (*who*), does not refer to the words τοῖς πιστεύουσιν (*those who believe*), but, by a *constructio ad sensum*, to the neuter substantive τέκνα θεοῦ (*children of God*). Ver. 13 unfolds this term: *children of God*, first in a negative relation, by means of three cumulative phrases which have a somewhat disdainful and even contemptuous character. Does John mean thereby to stigmatize the false confidence of the Jews in their character as children of Abraham? This does not seem to me probable. Three expressions to set forth the idea of the theocratic birth would be useless. Besides, the Prologue has too lofty a flight, too universal a bearing, to admit of so paltry a polemic. John means rather to set forth with emphasis the superiority of the second creation which the Logos comes to accomplish on the foundation of the first. There are two humanities, one which propagates itself in the way of natural filiation; the other, in which the higher life is communicated immediately by God Himself to every believer. It is, therefore, ordinary birth, as the basis of natural humanity, which John characterizes in the first three expressions. The first phrase: *not of blood*, denotes procreation from the purely physical point of view; the blood is mentioned as the seat of natural life (Lev. xvii. 1). The plural αἱμάτων has been applied either to the duality of the sexes, or

[1] Irenæus cites this passage three times in the form: *Qui natus est*, etc., applying these words, thus, to Christ Himself; and Tertullian so firmly believes in the authenticity of this reading, that he attributes the opposite reading—that of our text—to a falsification of Gnostic (Valentinian) origin. But the received reading is found in all our critical documents without exception.

to the series of human generations. It should rather be interpreted as the plural γάλαξι, in the words of Plato (Legg. x., p. 887, D): ἔτι ἐν γάλαξι τρεφόμενοι—the plural suggesting the multiplicity of the elements which form the blood (see *Meyer*). The two following phrases are not subordinate to the first, as St. Augustine thought, who, after having referred the latter to the two sexes, referred the two others, the one to the woman and the other to the man. The disjunctive negative, *neither . . . nor* (οὔτε . . . οὔτε), would be necessary in that case. The last two expressions designate, like the first, the natural birth; but this, while introducing, in the one phrase, the factor of the will governed by the sensual imagination (*the will of the flesh*), in the other, that of a will more independent of nature, more personal and more manlike, the will of man. There is a gradation in dignity from one of these terms to the other. But, to whatever height the transmission of natural life may rise, this communication of life-power cannot pass beyond the circle traced out at the first creation—that of the physico-psychical life. *That which is born of the flesh*, even in the best conditions, *is*, and remains *flesh*. The higher, spiritual, eternal life is the immediate gift of God. To obtain it, that divine begetting is needed by which God communicates His own nature. The limiting phrase, ἐκ θεοῦ (*of God*), contains, in itself alone, the antithesis to the three preceding phrases. By its very conciseness it expresses the beauty of that spiritual birth which is altogether free from material elements, from natural attraction, from human will, and in which the only coöperating forces are God acting through His Spirit on the one side, and man's faith on the other.

But how are we to explain the virtue of this faith which fits the man to be begotten of God? Does it have in itself, in its own nature, the secret of its power? No, for it is only a simple receptivity, a λαμβάνειν, *receive:* its virtue comes from its object. The apostle had already intimated this by the words: "who believe *on His name;*" and he now expressly declares it:

Ver. 14. "*And the Word became flesh and dwelt among us—and we beheld His glory, a glory as of the only-begotten Son coming from the presence of the Father—full*[1] *of grace and truth.* The connection between this verse and the preceding, which is involved in καί, *and*, is expressed in the following thought: If faith can make of a man born of the flesh a child of God, it is because it has for its object *the Word made flesh.* The coming of Christ upon earth in the flesh had been already mentioned in ver. 11, from the point of view of its relation to Israel, and of the unbelief by which it had been met. John proclaims again the great fact, the subject of his narrative, from the point of view of all mankind, and as the object of the faith of the Church. There is, therefore, no tautology in this repetition. It even reflects very faithfully the phases of the development of faith in the heart of those who were formerly Jews, like John and the apostles. They first witness the appearance of the Messiah in Israel

[1] D and some Fathers read: πληρη (agreeing with δοξαν), and Augustine: pleni (according to a variant πληρους ? ?) to be referred to *unigeniti.*

(*to His own*) ver. 11, and they see Him ignominiously rejected. But far from joining in this rejection, they receive Him as the promised Messiah, and through their faith in Him find the privileges of adoption and regeneration (vv. 12, 13). Then sounding in all its depths the object of a faith which is capable of effecting such wonders, they cry out: "This is the Word who has been made flesh!" The idea of the national Messiah was thus gradually transformed in them into that of the Son of God, the Saviour of mankind. The καί, *and*, is not, therefore, here a simple connecting copula. How, indeed, can we connect with one another by an *and* or an *and also* two ideas which are as unlike as those of 13b and 14a: "They are born of God," and (and *also*): "the Word became flesh." We do not think that the thought of the evangelist is any more successfully apprehended by paraphrasing this καί, as Luthardt does, "and *to tell the whole truth*," or, as Brückner, "and *in these circumstances*." The paraphrase of *Weiss-Meyer:* "And *this is the way in which* faith in Him was able to take form and produce such happy fruits . . . . ," amounts to nearly the same thing with our own explanation, which was already that of *Chrysostom, Grotius*, etc. The emphasis is not on the subject: *the Word;* this noun is repeated (instead of the simple pronoun) only with the purpose of better emphasizing the contrast between the subject and the predicate *became flesh*. The Word to which everything owes its existence, which created us ourselves, became a member of the human race. The word *flesh* properly denotes, in its strict sense, the soft parts of the body, as opposed either to the hard parts, the bones; thus when it is said, "Flesh of my flesh, bone of my bones" (Gen. ii. 23),—or to the blood (vi. 54). From this more restricted sense, a broader one is derived: the entire body, regarded from the view-point of its substance, the animated matter; so 1 Cor. xv. 39. Finally, as the flesh is properly the seat of physical sensibility, this word, by metonomy, often designates the entire human being, in so far as he is governed in his natural state by sensibility with respect to pleasure and pain. "*For also they are but flesh*," is said of men before the deluge, Gen. vi. 3. Comp. John xvii. 11; Ps. lxv. 1; Rom. iii. 20: *all flesh, no flesh*, for: every man, no man. Undoubtedly, the desire of enjoyment and the dread of suffering are not in themselves criminal instincts. They are often the precious means by which man escapes from a multitude of losses and injuries of which he would otherwise not be conscious. Still more: without this double natural sensibility, man would never be able to offer to God anything but "sacrifices which cost him nothing." He could not himself become "a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God" (Rom. xii. 1), and thereby fulfill his noblest destiny, that of glorifying God by the sacrifice of himself. But, on the other hand, it cannot be denied that in these two natural propensities lies the possibility of temptation and sin. Human nature in this critical condition: such is the form of existence which the Word has consented to take for himself. The expression *became flesh*, accordingly signifies, first of all, that the Word left the immaterial state of divine being to assume a body, and to confine Himself, like the creature, within the limits of time and space. But the

word *flesh* expresses much more than this. Since the work of *Zeller* (*Theol. Jahrb.* 1842), the Tübingen school makes John say that the Logos borrowed from humanity only the material body, while He Himself filled, in Jesus, the office of the *spirit* in every other man (the old theory of Apollinaris). But John does not dream of any such thing. We have just proved that the word *flesh* often designates the entire human person (*spirit, soul and body*, 1 Thess. v. 23). This is certainly the case in this passage. The expression: "*the* Word became body," would have no meaning. It would have been necessary to say: took a body. Jesus sometimes speaks in our Gospel of *His soul*, and of His soul as *troubled* (xii. 27). It is related of Him that He groaned or that He was troubled in *His spirit* (xi. 33; xiii. 21), that He *gave up His spirit* (xix. 30); all this implies that the Logos does not play the part of the spirit in the person of Jesus. The spirit of Jesus is, as in every man, one of the elements of the human nature, like the soul and the body. It follows from this that *the flesh* denotes, in our passage, complete human nature. Consequently, this term *flesh* is not intended to describe merely the visibility or corporeity of Jesus (*de Wette, Reuss, Baur*), or even the poverty and weakness of His earthly manifestation (*Olshausen, Tholuck*). It designates the *reality* and *integrity* of the human mode of existence into which Jesus entered. In virtue of this incarnation, He was able to suffer, to enjoy, to be tempted, to struggle, to learn, to make progress, to love, to pray, exactly *like us;* comp. Heb. ii. 17. The phrase *ἄνθρωπος ἐγένετο, became man*, would have expressed nearly the same idea; only it would have described Jesus as a particular personality, as a definite representative of the human type, and it might have been imagined that *this* man had reserved for Himself an exceptional position in the race. The term *flesh*, which denotes only the state, the mode of existence, more clearly affirms the complete homogeneity between His condition and ours. Moreover, Jesus does not hesitate to apply to Himself the word *ἄνθρωπος, man*, John viii. 40; and the name by which in preference to all others He described Himself, was *Son of man* (see on i. 52).

The word which fills the interval between the subject, *the Word*, and the predicate, *flesh*, is the verb *ἐγένετο, became*. The word *become*, when it has a substantive for its predicate, implies a profound transformation in the subject's mode of being. Thus ii. 9: "The water *became* wine" (*τὸ ὕδωρ οἶνον γεγενημένον*). When a person is in question, this word *become*, without implicating his identity, indicates that he has changed his condition; for example, in the expression: The king become a shepherd. *Baur* and *Reuss* affirm that, in the evangelist's thought, the Logos, though becoming flesh, remained in possession not only of His consciousness, but also of His attributes as Logos. He clothed Himself, indeed, with a body, according to them, but as if with a temporary covering. "This incarnation was for Him only something accessory" (Reuss, ii., p. 456). Yet this scholar cannot help saying (p. 451): "There is nothing but the word *become* which positively affirms that, in coming, He changed the form of His existence." Certainly! And we affirm nothing more, but nothing

less. The word *become* shows, indeed, that this change reached even the foundation of the existence of the Logos. This natural sense of the word *become* is not invalidated by the expression *is come in the flesh*, 1 John iv. 2, in which Reuss finds the affirmation of the preserving of His original nature with all its attributes, but which really involves only the continuity of His personality. The personal subject in the Logos remained the same when He passed from the divine state to the human state, but with the complete surrender of all the divine attributes, the possession of which would have been incompatible with the reality of the human mode of existence. And if He ever recovers the divine state, it will not be by renouncing His human personality, but by exalting it even to the point where it can become the organ of the divine state. This, as it seems to us, is the true Christological conception, as it appears in the Scriptures generally, and in our passage in particular.

The content of John's declaration, therefore, is not: Two natures or two opposite modes of being co-existing in the same subject; but a single subject passing from one mode of being to another, in order to recover the first by perfectly realizing the second. The teaching of John, as thus understood, is in complete harmony with that of Paul. That apostle says, indeed, Phil. ii. 6–8: "He who was in the form of God . . . emptied (divested) Himself, having taken the form of a servant and having become like to men;" and 2 Cor. viii. 9: "Though He was rich, He *became poor*, that ye through His poverty might be rich." These passages express, in a form which is completely independent of that of John, a conception which is identically the same: The incarnation by means of a divesting (κένωσις). We shall see that the whole Gospel history, and especially the picture of Jesus which is traced by our evangelist, accords perfectly, notwithstanding all the contrary assertions of *Reuss*, with the thesis of the Prologue as thus understood.

After having entered the human life, the Word took up His abode there and appropriated it to Himself even to the end; this is expressed by the following clause. The word σκηνοῦν, literally, *to dwell in a tent*, contains, according to *Meyer*, *Reuss*, etc., an allusion to a technical word in the religious philosophy of the later Jews, Shechinah (*the dwelling-place*), which denoted the visible forms by which Jehovah manifested His presence in the midst of His people. We might see thus in this word σκηνοῦν, *to live in a tent*, especially with the limiting phrase ἐν ἡμῖν, *among us*, an allusion to the Tabernacle in the wilderness, which was, as it were, the tent of Jehovah, Himself a pilgrim among His pilgrim people. To this conformity between the sort of habitation which Jehovah had and that of His people answers the complete community in the mode of existence between the incarnate Word and men, His brethren. Perhaps, these allusions are somewhat refined and John's thought is merely that of comparing the flesh of Jesus (His humanity) to a tent like ours (2 Cor. v. 1). This word σκηνοῦν, *to camp*, denotes, in any case, all the familiar relations which He sustained with His fellow-men; varied relations like those which a pilgrim sustains towards the other members of the caravan. It is as if John had

said: "We ate and drank at the same table, slept under the same roof, walked and journeyed together; we knew Him as son, brother, friend, guest, citizen. Even to the end, He remained faithful to the path on which He entered when He became a man." This expression, therefore, calls to mind all the condescension of that divine being, who thus veiled His majesty in order to share in the existence of the companions of His journey. —The limiting phrase ἐν ἡμῖν, *among us*, does not refer to men in general, nor even to the Church in its totality. In connection with the word σκηνοῦν, *to live in a tent*, and with the following phrase, *we beheld*, it can only designate the immediate witnesses of the earthly existence of Jesus, who sustained towards Him the familiar relations comprised in the notion of life in common. The expression of the general feeling of the Church will come later, vv. 16–18.

According as this spectacle presents itself to the thought of the evangelist, and assumes, in the words *among us*, the character of the most personal recollection, it becomes to him the object of delightful contemplation. The phrase is broken. The word *us*, of the limiting phrase, suddenly becomes the subject, while the subject, the Word and His glory, passes into the position of the grammatical object: "*And we beheld His glory.*" How easily may this change of construction be understood in the writing of an eye-witness! We observe the reverse change in the first verses of 1 John: "*That which we have heard, that which we beheld of the Word of life . . . , for the life was manifested and we have seen it, this it is which we declare unto you.*" Here, the apostle begins with the impression received —it is a letter—to pass from this to the fact itself. But in the Gospel, where he speaks as a historian, after having started from the fact, he describes the ineffable joy which the witnesses experienced in this sight. The word θεᾶσθαι (*to behold*), is richer than ὁρᾶν (*to see, to discern*); it is the *restful seeing*, as Luthardt says, with an idea of satisfaction, while to ὁρᾶν attaches rather the idea of knowledge. *Baur, Keim, Reuss*, apply this word *behold* here to a purely spiritual act, the inward sight of Christ which is granted to every believer; comp. 1 Ep. iii. 6: "He that sinneth hath not seen him;" and 2 Cor. iii. 18. We may understand the design of this interpretation. These critics refuse to recognize in the evangelist a witness, and yet they would not wish to make him an impostor. This expedient, therefore, alone remains. But this expedient involves inextricable difficulty, as we have shown in the Introduction (pp. 201–202). How could there be a question here of the glorified Christ, as an object of the spiritual contemplation of believers? Are we not at the opening of the narrative of the earthly life of Christ, at the moment when the coming of the Logos in the flesh and His condescension towards the companions of His earthly career have just been pointed out? To attribute to the word *behold* in such a context a purely spiritual sense, is to set at nought the evidence. Undoubtedly, the witnesses had more than the sight of the body. This beholding was an internal perception. But the first was the means of the second.

The object of the beholding was *the glory* of the Word. The glory of

God is the beaming forth of His perfections before the eyes of His creatures. This glory is really unique; every glory which any being whatsoever possesses is only the participation in some measure of the splendor which is sent forth by the perfection of God Himself. The glory which the witnesses of the earthly life of the Logos beheld in Him could not be the splendor which He enjoyed in His pre-existent state. For this glory Jesus asks again in xvii. 5: "And now, Father, glorify thou me with thyself, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." One does not ask again for what one still possesses. *Reuss* claims that it is only "the most arbitrary harmonistic," which can ascribe to John the idea that the Logos divested Himself of the divine attributes when he became incarnate (*Théol. johann.*, p. 120). But as for this harmonistic, it is John himself who suggests it in the prayer of Jesus which we have just quoted, and this is in full harmony with Paul (Phil ii. 6 ff.). What must we understand, then, by that glory of Jesus, of which John here speaks, and which is not that of the pre-existent Logos? In Chap. ii., ver. 11, after the miracle of Cana, John says: "And he manifested his glory." We might conclude from this that, as *Weiss* thinks, the earthly glory of the Logos consisted in the works of omnipotence, as well as in the words of omniscience, which the Father gave Him to do and to utter. Nevertheless, in chap. xvii. 10, Jesus says: "I am glorified *in them*," and this expression leads us to a more spiritual idea of the glory which He possessed here on earth. Even in our verse, the words: *full of grace and truth*, describe the Word and give us a much more moral notion of His glory than the explanation of Weiss implies. The essential character of this earthly glory of the Logos was, as it appears to me, the stamp of sonship impressed upon the whole human life of Jesus, the intimate communion with the Father which so profoundly distinguished His life from every other. Jesus puts us upon the right path when, before uttering the words: "I am glorified in them," He says (xvii. 10): "All things that are mine are thine, and all things that are thine are mine." Such a relation with God is the most complete glory which can irradiate the face of a human being. It comprehends, of course, all the manifestations of such a relation, thus works of power, words of wisdom, the life of holiness and charity, all of divine grandeur and beauty, that the disciples beheld in Jesus. This explanation agrees with that of John himself in the following words: "A glory as of the only-begotten from the Father." The conjunction ὡς, *as*, does not certainly express here a comparison between two similar things, but, as is often the case, the absolute agreement between the fact and the idea: a glory as (must be) that of the Son coming from the presence of the Father. *Weiss* urges against this explanation the absence of the article τοῦ, *of the*, before the words: *only-begotten Son* and *Father;* and further, the most natural sense of ὡς, *as*, which is that of comparison. He translates accordingly, "A glory like to that of *an* only-begotten Son coming from *a* father," in the sense that every only son inherits the rank and fortune of his father. Thus in this case it was seen that God had conveyed *all* His glory to Jesus. But this explanation

would imply that every father, who has an only son, possesses also a great fortune to convey to him, which is by no means true. The absence of the article, which leads Weiss to an explanation which is so forced, is much better explained by the fact that the terms *only Son* and *Father* are treated here as proper names, or at least as substantives designating single beings of their kind (*Winer's Grammar*, § 18). Indeed, the Father in question is *the Father*, in the absolute sense, the one from whom every one who is called *father* in heaven and on earth derives his paternal character (Eph. ii. 15); and this *only Son* is the only one, not merely as the sole son of this father, but inasmuch as He is the absolute model and prototype of every one who among the sons of men bears the name of only son. With reference to ὡς, *as*, used to indicate the complete agreement of the fact with the idea, comp. the quite similar ὡς in Matt. vii. 29; 1 Cor. v. 3; 2 Cor. ii. 17; Gal. iii. 16, etc. The glory of the incarnate Logos was undoubtedly, therefore, a humbler glory than that of his pre-existent state, but a glory which, nevertheless, marked Him as united to God by the bond of an unparalleled filial intimacy. There was seen in Him, as never in any man, the assurance of being loved paternally by God, of the power of asking everything of Him with the certainty of being heard, and at the same time the most perfect filial fidelity towards Him. This unique glory of the Word made flesh the apostle describes, when he characterizes the entire earthly manifestation of the Word by that last stroke of his pencil: *Full of grace and truth.* We refer these words to the principal subject of the whole sentence, the Word. This is the simple and correct construction of the nominative πλήρης, *full;* it is also that which gives the best sense. Undoubtedly, this adjective might be made a nominative absolute, with *Grotius*, *Meyer*, *Luthardt*, *Weiss* and others, by referring it either to δόξαν: "*glory full* of grace . . ." (hence the reading πλήρη in D), or rather to αὐτοῦ *of him*, "His glory, *His who was full* of grace . . ." (hence the reading *pleni* in *Augustine*). But these explanations, which are grammatically possible, appear to me to misconceive the true movement of the sentence. Carried away by the charm of the recollection, the evangelist interrupted the historical description of the relations which the Word sustained to those who surrounded Him; he now takes up again the picture which remained unfinished,—not that a parenthesis must be supposed including the words from καί to πατρός; there is no deliberate interruption; the ardor of feeling caused the break in the sentence, which is now completed. In the Old Testament, the two essential features of the character of God were *grace* and *truth* (Ex. xxxiv. 6): "*abundant in grace and truth.*" These are also the two features which, in John's view, distinguished the human life of the Word made flesh, and which served to reveal to Him His filial relation to the Father. *Grace:* the divine love investing the character with affableness towards friends, with condescension towards inferiors, with compassion towards the wretched, with pardon towards the guilty; God consenting to *give Himself.* And as it is from grace that *life* flows forth, the Word became anew for believers, by reason of this first characteristic, what He had been originally for the world (ver.

4), the source of life. The second feature, *truth*, is the reality of things adequately brought to light. And, as the essence of things is the moral idea which presides over the existence of each one of them, truth is the holy and good thought of God completely unveiled; it is God *revealed*. Through this attribute the incarnate Word also became anew what He originally was, the *light* of men (vv. 4, 5). By these two essential attributes of Jesus' character, therefore, the witnesses of His life were able to recognize in Him the only Son coming from the presence of the Father. Their feeling was this: This being is God *given*, God *revealed* in a human existence.

As a man who has made an important discovery recalls with satisfaction the suggestions which caused the first awakening of his thought and set his mind on its way forward, so from this experience, which he had had, the apostle transports himself to the decisive moment when he heard the first revelation of the fact of the incarnation. Not understood at the beginning, but afterwards made clear. For it is to this divine fact that the word of the forerunner which he is about to cite refers. John detaches this testimony from the historical situation in which it was declared, and which will be expressly recalled in ver. 30; and he makes use of it, at this time, simply with a didactic purpose, confirming by its means the capital fact of the incarnation, set forth in ver. 14. It is the second testimony, that of the official divine herald, following after that of the eye-witnesses.

Ver. 15. *John bears witness of him, and cries, saying:*[1] *This is he of whom I spoke when I said,*[2] *He who comes after me hath preceded me, because he was before me.*" The present, *bears witness* is ordinarily explained by the *permanent* value of this testimony; but perhaps it is due rather to the fact that the author transports himself in a life-like way backward to the moment when he heard this mysterious saying coming from such lips; he seems to himself to hear it still. The perfect κέκραγε is always used in Greek in the sense of the present: *he cries;* this declaration was made with the solemnity of an official proclamation. According to the reading of B. C. and Origen, we must, in order to give sense to these words: *it was he who spake*, put them in a parenthesis, as Westcott and Hort do, and thus ascribe to the evangelist the most inept of repetitions. See where these critics lead us by the critical system which they have once for all adopted! The reading of ℵ is equally inadmissible. According to ver. 30, the forerunner uttered this saying on the next day after the deputation of the Sanhedrim had officially presented to him the question relating to his mission. After having expressly declined the honor of being the Messiah in the presence of these delegates, he had added in mysterious words, that that personage was already present and was immediately to succeed him, although in reality He had been already present before him (vv. 26, 27). The next day, he made this declaration again before the people, but this

[1] ℵ D[b] omit λεγων.

[2] B. C. Or. (once) read ο ειπων (*he who spake*) instead of ον ειπον (*of whom I spake*). ℵ omits these words and adds ος after ερχομενος (*he who cometh after me was the one who was*, etc.).

time designating Jesus positively as the one of whom he had spoken on the preceding day, and adding an explanation with reference to that previous existence which he attributed to Him as compared with himself (ver. 30). This second more full declaration the evangelist quotes in ver. 15; because it was the first which referred personally and intelligibly to Jesus,—Jesus not being present on the previous day. It may be asked why there is this slight difference between the cited declaration and that of ver. 15, that there John the Baptist says οὗτός ἐστι, "this *is* he," while, in ver. 15, the evangelist makes him say: οὗτος ἦν, "this *was* he." The first form seems more in harmony with the immediate presence of the one to whom the testimony refers: "This *is* he of whom I was saying yesterday . . . You see him there!" This form perfectly suits the original testimony. The form: This *was*, might have been also suitable in the Baptist's mouth. It only called up the fact that it was He of whom he had thought on the preceding day, when speaking as he had done. But it proceeds rather from the evangelist; for it is natural from the standpoint more remote from the fact, at which he now is.

The testimony here reproduced by the apostle has a paradoxical cast in harmony with the original character of John the Baptist: "He who follows me has preceded me." There was something in the apparent contradiction of these two verbs to excite the attention and stimulate the mental activity of those to whom the saying was addressed. Many interpreters, as if making a point of depriving this saying of what in fact gives it its point, have assigned to the word *has preceded me* the sense of *has surpassed me* (*Chrysostom, Tholuck, Olshausen, de Wette, Lücke, Luthardt*). But what is there surprising in the fact that he who comes afterward should be superior to the one who goes before him? Is it not so in ordinary life? Does not the herald precede the sovereign? A platitude, therefore, is ascribed to John the Baptist. *Hofmann* has felt this. And instead of referring one of these verbs to *time* and the other to *dignity*, he applies them both to *dignity*, in this sense: "He who was at first inferior to me (who went behind me as my disciple) has become my superior (goes before me now as my master)." But Jesus was never in the position of a disciple with relation to John, and no more did He become his master. Besides, the words μείζων and ἐλάσσων would have presented themselves much more naturally for the expression of this idea. Let us remember that the evangelist has as his aim to prove by the testimony of the forerunner the dignity of the Logos incarnate, which is attributed to Jesus; now it is precisely the *temporal* sense which is adapted to this aim, and if one of the two prepositions refers to time, the other must refer to it also: for the apparent contradiction of the two terms is what gives this saying all its meaning. "He who is my successor preceded me" (*Luther, Meyer, Bäumlein, Weiss, Keil*, etc.). *My successor:* as to the Messianic work; Jesus appeared on the stage after John. And yet *He was before Him.* How so? By His presence and activity in the whole period of the Old Covenant. The Christ really preceded His forerunner in the world; comp. xii. 41; 1 Cor. x. 4, and the passage in Malachi (iii. 1), where John the Baptist

found this idea, as we shall see. The perfect γέγονε does not mean *existed*, but *was there* (in fact); comp. vi. 25.

On repeating this enigmatical word on the next day, John added to it the phrase which should give a glimpse of the solution of the enigma: *because he was before me*, or more literally, "*my first.*" Here also, many refer the word *first* to superiority of *rank*, not of *time*, (*Chrysostom, Beza, Calvin, Hofmann, Luthardt*); but the imperfect *was* is opposed to this sense; *is* would have been necessary. Objection is made to the tautology between this proposition and the preceding one, if both refer to time. But it is forgotten that there is a difference between γέγονε, which places us on the ground of history: *was there*, and ἦν, *was*, which refers to the essence of the Logos, to the eternal order to which He by nature belongs. He did not pass from nothingness into being, like His forerunner. If He preceded the latter on the field of history, it was because, in reality, He belonged to an order of things superior to that of time. Many interpreters (*Meyer, Bäumlein*), who take the word *first* in the same sense as ourselves, say that the superlative πρῶτος is put here for the comparative πρότερος, *anterior to*, and they cite as an example xv. 18. But John avoids the comparative because it would refer to the relation of two persons, who both belonged to the same order of things, and consequently might be compared with each other. Now it is not so in this case; and any comparison is impossible. Jesus is not only anterior to John; He is, speaking absolutely, *first* with relation to him and to everything that is in time. Hence the expression: *my first*. And such, indeed, is also the meaning in xv. 18. For Jesus was not merely persecuted before the disciples, as their equal; He it is who in them is the real object of the persecution. This last clause contains, accordingly, the solution of the apparent contradiction presented by the two preceding clauses. It was possible for Him to be the predecessor of His forerunner, since He appertains to the eternal order.

It is alleged that John the Baptist cannot have uttered such a saying, which already implies knowledge of the divinity of the Messiah, a knowledge which was developed only afterwards in the Church. It is the evangelist, then, who puts it into his mouth (*Strauss, Weiss, de Wette*), or who, at least, modifies in this way some expression which he had heard from his mouth, and in which the forerunner proclaimed the superior dignity of Jesus (*Weiss*). On the other hand, *Lücke, Meyer, Brückner* and others, defend the historical accuracy of this saying. And, in fact, the preexistence of the Messiah already forms a part of the teaching of the Old Testament; comp. Is. ix. 5; Micah v. 1; Dan. vii. 13, 14. *Bertholdt*, in his *Christologia Judæorum*, p. 131, has demonstrated the presence of this idea in the Rabbinical writings. It is found in the book of Enoch and in the fourth book of Esdras (Schürer, *Lehrb. der N. T. Gesch.*, § 29, 3). Far from having borrowed it from the Christians, the Jewish theology turned away from it rather, in its struggle with Christianity (Schürer, *ibid.*). If this saying were, either in whole or in part, a composition of the evangelist, it would be sufficient for him to place it in his Prologue; he would

not allow himself to return to it again twice in the course of the following narrative, in order to point out the historical situation in which John had uttered it, fixing exactly the place, the moment, the occasion (vv. 26, 27, 30), and marking the progress in its terms from one occasion to the other. Besides, the original and enigmatical form in which it is presented would be enough to guarantee its authenticity. In this respect, it offers a full analogy to the indisputably authentic saying of the forerunner in iii. 30. Let us not forget that there was in the Old Testament a passage which, more than any other, contained, as it were, the programme of John the Baptist's mission, a passage which he must have read again and again, and which was the text of the declaration which occupies our attention. It is Mal. iii. 1: "Behold, I send my messenger before me, and he prepares my way." If the Messiah sends His messenger before Him, that is, in order Himself soon to follow him, and if this sending consists in a birth, it is clear that the Messiah must necessarily exist before His successor. Simple common sense forces upon us this conclusion, which John the Baptist well knew how to draw. Finally, even independently of all this, the forerunner had received special revelations, instructions relative to his mission: "He who *sent* me to baptize with water, he *said to me;*" thus he expresses himself, alluding to a direct communication, a sort of theophany which had been granted to him (i. 33). It is impossible, therefore, that, with the vision of the baptism to crown this special prophetic preparation, he should not have had his eyes open to understand fully the superior dignity of the One whom God Himself saluted with the title of His *well-beloved Son.*

The evangelist has made us hear the testimony of the immediate witnesses of the life of Christ (ver. 14), then, that of the herald sent to prepare the way for Him (ver. 15); it only remains for him to formulate that which comes forth from the experience of the whole Church.

Ver. 16. "*And*[1] *of his fullness we have all received, and grace for grace.*" By that first feature of the divine character, *grace*, the Church recognized in Jesus the Word made flesh. The two words, χάρις (*grace*), and πλήρωμα (*fullness*), closely connect this sentence with the last words of ver. 14. The experience which the Church has had, has come to set the seal upon the testimony of those who surrounded Jesus when on earth. Since *Heracleon* and *Origen*, many (*Luther, Melanchthon*, etc.), have made ver. 16 the continuation of John the Baptist's discourse (ver. 15). And it is possible that from this explanation the reading ὅτι (*because*), arose, which the Alexandrian authorities, Origen, and some other documents substitute for καί (*and*) read by T. R. at the beginning of the verse. The *we all* of ver. 16, which implies the existence of the Church, in any case excludes the supposition that John the Baptist is still speaking in ver. 16. As to ὅτι (*because*), if it were the true reading, it would be necessary to make it relate either to the testimony of the apostles in ver. 14, or to that of the Baptist in ver.

[1] Instead of καί, which is the reading of T. R. with A E F G H Γ Δ Λ Π, Syr$^{cur.}$; Syr$^{sch.}$; Syr.; It$^{alq.}$; and most of the Mnn., ὅτι is read in ℵ, B C D L X, It$^{alq.}$ Cop. Some Mnn and some Fathers, in particular Origen (3 times).

15. The first reference is not possible, since it would force us to make ver. 15 a simple parenthesis, which is inadmissible; the second is no more possible; since it would be necessary in that case to refer this *because*, as *Weiss* attempts to do, not to the contents of John's testimony (ver. 15), but to the very *act* of the testimony, and thus to the verb *he testifies:* "John testifies thus of Jesus, because indeed we have all received . . ." A connection which is, grammatically and logically speaking, more unnatural cannot be imagined. Nothing is more natural, on the contrary, than the connection through καί (*and*) in the T. R.; this *and* expresses very simply the addition of the third testimony, that of the Church, to the two others. This reading, therefore, is certainly the true one; it is found already in the oldest Syriac version, the Curetonian Syriac. The other is due to Heracleon's false interpretation, which was followed by Origen.

The word πλήρωμα which properly denotes that which serves to fill an empty space, refers to the inexhaustible fullness of grace and truth by which the person of the Logos is filled and with which it overflows. This word πλήρωμα is used here in the most simple and natural way, in the same sense as in Rom. xv. 29 (πλήρωμα εὐλογίας, *fullness of blessing*), and without the least analogy to the mythological sense, which the Gnostics of the second century gave to it in their systems. In the words *we all* are included all the believers mentioned in ver. 12, the Church already extended through every country of the East and the West at the time when John wrote this Prologue. The verb: *we have received* is left without an object. The question at first is not of such or such a gift received, but only of *the act* of *receiving.* "We have all drawn, richly drawn from this invisible source." The witnesses had *beheld* (ver. 14); the Church *has received.* In the following words, John states precisely what it has received. First, *grace*—that first sign by which it had recognized in Him the divine Logos; then, *truth;* this second sign will be noticed in vv. 17, 18. The καί, *and*, signifies here: "and this is the way." The words "grace for grace" are ordinarily translated "grace *upon* grace." That would simply mean, grace added to previous grace. But, with this sense, would not John rather have used the preposition ἐπί (Phil. ii. 27)? In the following verse, grace is opposed to the law. It must, therefore, be supposed that John has this antithesis already present to his mind, and that this is the reason why he seeks to bring out with emphasis in ver. 16 the peculiar character of the grace. Under the rule of the law each new grace must be obtained at the cost of a new work. In the economy of grace which faith in the Word made flesh opens, the gift already received is the one title to the obtaining of a new gift: "To him who hath, more is given." There is enthusiasm in this paradoxical formula which exalts the system of grace by setting it in such complete opposition to that of the law. No one defends any longer, at the present day, the explanation of the ancient Greek interpreters, who thought they saw here the supplying the place of the gift of the Old Covenant by the superior gift of the New Covenant. The following verse, where grace, as such, is opposed to the law, would be sufficient to exclude such an interpretation. That of

Calov, who imagined he could see here the grace of *salvation* replacing the happy state which man possessed before the fall, is still more unfortunate.

Ver. 16 describes *grace;* ver. 18 will describe *truth;* ver. 17 which connects them, unites grace and truth:

Ver. 17. "*For the law was given by Moses; grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.*" John, who had reached the light of the new revelation through the preparatory system of the old, could not fail to point out in this Prologue, at least summarily, the relation between the two; and he does it naturally in this place, where the mention of the two divine gifts obtained through Jesus Christ summons him to a comparison with those which the ancient people of God had received, especially with the law. The *for* refers to the idea of grace, which has been so forcibly expressed in ver. 16: "grace upon grace; *for* the legal system has given place henceforth to that of free grace which is, at the same time, that of truth." We meet again, in this verse, the parallel construction peculiar to the Hebrew; a Greek writer would not have failed to mark the antithesis between the two clauses of this verse by the particles μέν and δέ. The office of the *law* is to command and to demand; the peculiarity of grace, the essence of the Gospel, is to offer and to give. The law connects salvation with a work which it exacts; Christ gives gratuitously a salvation which is to become the cause of works. Now this whole manifestation of grace fully reveals at last the *true* character of God, which remained veiled in the law, and consequently it reveals *truth* which is the perfect knowledge of God. *Bengel* explains the opposition between the law and the two following terms by this ingenious formula: *lex iram parans et umbram habens;* but perhaps this is the mark of Paul rather than of John. *Weiss* makes grace consist in the revelation of truth; that is to say, of God as love. *Keil*, in the opposite way, makes the truth of God consist in the revelation of His grace, which is more true. But John seems to me rather to place these two gifts in juxtaposition and to regard them as distinct from each other; grace is God possessed; truth is God known. These two gifts are joined together, but they are distinct. So John, after having developed the first in ver. 16, sets forth the second in ver. 18.

The term *was given*, ἐδόθη, recalls the positive and outward institution of the law, its official promulgation. The expression *came*, literally *became*, suits better the historical manifestation of grace and truth in the person and in the ministry of Jesus Christ. Moses may disappear; the law given by him remains. But take away Jesus Christ, and the grace and truth manifested in Him disappear. "John," says Bengel on this point, "chose his expressions with the strictness of a philosopher." Let us rather say, with the emphatic precision which is the characteristic of inspiration.

It is at this point of the Prologue that the apostle introduces, for the first time, the name so long expected, *Jesus Christ*. He descends gradually from the divine to the human: the Logos (ver. 1), the only-begotten Son (ver. 14), finally, Jesus Christ, in whom the heavenly world fully assumes for us life and reality. The apostle now passes to the second characteristic of the divine glory of Jesus Christ: truth, ver. 18.

Ver. 18. "*No one has ever seen God; the only-begotten Son,*[1] *who is in the bosom of the Father, he has revealed him to us.*"—The absence of a particle between vv. 17 and 18 is the proof of a very intimate relation of thought or feeling between the two. The second becomes thus, as it were, an energetic reaffirmation of the preceding. And in fact, what is this *truth* born for the earth in the person of Jesus Christ, according to ver. 17, if it is not the perfect revelation of God described in ver. 18?—The true knowledge of God is not the result of philosophical investigation; our reason can seize only some isolated rays of the divine revelation shed abroad in nature and in conscience. It does not succeed in making of them a whole, because it cannot ascend to the living focus from which they emanate. The theocratic revelations themselves, which were granted to the saints of the Old Covenant, contained only an approximate manifestation of the divine being, as the Lord caused Moses to understand, at the very moment when He was about to make him behold something of His glory: "Thou shalt see my back; but my face shall not be seen" (Ex. xxxiii. 23). This central and living knowledge of God which is the only true knowledge, and which has as its symbol *sight*, was not possessed by any man, either within or outside of the theocracy, not even by Moses. The word *God* is placed at the beginning, although it is the object, because it is the principal idea. One can know everything else, not God! The perfect ἑώρακε, *has seen*, denotes a result, rather than an act, which would be indicated by the aorist: "No one *is in possession* of the sight of God, and consequently no one can speak of Him *de visu*." The full truth does not exist on earth before or outside of Jesus Christ; it truly *came* through Him. The Alexandrian reading *God only-begotten*, μονογενὴς θεός, or, according to ℵ, *the* (ὁ) *only-begotten God*, long since abandoned, has found in *Hort*[2] a learned and sagacious defender, who has gained the assent of two such scholars as *Harnack*[3] and *Weiss*.[4] The received reading has been defended, with at least equal erudition and skill, by the American critic, *Ezra Abbot*, in an article in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Oct., 1861, and in a more recent essay in the *Unitarian Review*, 1875. The result of these studies with reference to the external testimonies, is: 1. That the two readings must have already co-existed in the second century. It is probable that both of the two are found already in *Irenæus*. The received reading was read in the *Itala* and by Tertullian; the other, that of the Alexandrian authorities, by Clement of Alex.;[5] 2. That the latter is found only in the

[1] T. R. reads ο μονογενης υιος (*the only-begotten Son*) with 24 Mjj., from the fifth to the tenth cent., A E F G . . . X Γ Δ Λ, etc., almost all the Mnn. It. Syr$^{cur.}$; Syr$^{hare.}$; Iren. (twice), Orig. (once), Tert., Eus. (six times), Athan. (four times), the emperor Julian (twice) Chrys., Theod., etc. The reading μονογενης θεος (ℵ ο μονογ. θ.) (*God only-begotten*) is found in ℵ B C L 33 Syr$^{sch.}$ Ir. (once), Clem. (twice), Orig. (twice), Epiph. (three times).—D has a vacancy here.

[2] *Two dissertations on* μονογενὴς θεός, Cambridge, 1875.

[3] *Schürer's Literatur-Zeitung*, 1876, No. 21.

[4] Sixth ed. of *Meyer's Commentary*.

[5] It has been wrongly believed that among the witnesses for the latter reading, the Valentinian Ptolemy could be ranked, in accordance with a fragment from this Gnostic quoted by Irenæus (i. 8, 5). It does not follow from this quotation that Ptolemy read in his copy θεός instead of υἱός, nor that the quotation refers to John i. 18. (See Keil, p. 101.)

Egyptian documents (Fathers, versions and manuscripts), and that the documents of all other countries present the received reading; thus for the West, the *Itala*, *Tertullian* and all the Latin Fathers without exception, —the only exception which has been cited, that of *Hilary*, is only apparent, as *Abbot* proves:—in Syria and Palestine, the ancient *Syriac* translation of Cureton, *Eusebius*, *Chrysostom*, *Theodoret*, etc.; and, what is more surprising, in Egypt *Athanasius* himself, the most inflexible defender of the divinity of Christ. Does it not seem to follow from this, that the Alexandrian reading is due to a purely local influence, which goes back even to the second century? As to internal reasons, as favoring the Alexandrian reading, stress may be laid upon its unique and wholly strange character; for it is said to be more improbable that it should be replaced by the received reading, which has a more simple and common character, than that the contrary could have taken place. But it may also be asked whether a reading which does not find its counterpart in any writing of the New Testament, and in any passage of John himself, does not become by reason of this fact very suspicious. To account for its rejection it is enough that an explanation be given as to how it may have originated and been introduced, and *Abbot* does this by reminding us how early readings like the following were originated: *the Logos-God*, which is found in the second century in Melito and Clement of Alexandria, and the epithet *θεοτόκος*, *mother of God*, given to Mary. Hence, readings like these: *the body of God*, instead of *the body of Jesus*, John xix. 40, in A; or *all were waiting for God*, instead of *all were waiting for Him* (Jesus), Luke viii. 40, in ; or *the Church of God which He purchased with His own blood*, instead of *the Church of the Lord*, etc. (Acts xx. 28), in ℵ and B. It is curious that it is precisely these same two MSS., which especially support the reading *God*, instead of *Son*, in our passage. It would be difficult, on the other hand, to explain the dogmatic reason which could have substituted here the word *Son* for *God*. The Arians themselves, as Abbot has well shown, had no interest in this change; for they were able to make use of the Alexandrian reading to prove that the word *God* could be taken in a weakened sense, and designate a divine being of second rank, inferior to the Father; it was for them the best means of getting rid of the word *God* applied to the Word in ver. 1. So Athanasius himself does not hesitate to use the received reading; as for ourselves, we cannot hesitate. The absence of any parallel to the Alexandrian reading and its very pronounced doctrinal savor seem to us, independently of external criticism, sufficient reasons for rejecting it. It is true that *Hort* and *Weiss* urge against the received reading the article *ὁ*, *the*, before the title *only-begotten Son*, for the reason that Jesus, not having been yet called by this name in the Prologue, could not be thus designated with the definite article. This objection falls to the ground through the true explanation of ver. 14, where the words *only-begotten Son* cannot denote *an* only-begotten Son in general, as Weiss will have it, and can only be applied to the Word made flesh. Moreover, even without this preceding expression, no reader, when reading the words: "The only-begotten Son has revealed

him to us" could for an instant doubt concerning whom John meant to speak.

The character of complete revelator ascribed here to Jesus is explained by His intimate and personal relation with God Himself, such as is described in the following words: *who is in the bosom of the Father.* The participle *ὁ ὤν, who is,* is connected in a very close logical relation with the following verb: *He has revealed.* As *Bäumlein* says, it is equivalent to *ὅτι ὤν, inasmuch as He is;* thereupon rests His competency to reveal.—The figure which John employs might be derived from the position of two nearest guests at a banquet (xiii. 23); but it seems rather to be borrowed from the position of a son seated on his father's knees and resting on his bosom. It is the emblem of a complete opening of the heart; he who occupies this place in relation to God must know the most secret thoughts of the Father and His inmost will. The word *κόλπος, bosom,* would by itself prove that the mystery of the Son's existence is a matter, not of metaphysics, but of love, comp. xvii. 24: "Thou didst love me before the foundation of the world." The omission of the words *ὁ ὤν* in ℵ is a negligence condemned by all the other MSS. Must we, with *Hofmann, Luthardt* and *Weiss,* refer the words: "who is in the bosom of the Father" to the present glorified condition of Jesus? But the heavenly state which Jesus now enjoys cannot explain how He was able to reveal the Father perfectly while He was on the earth. We must then, in that case, refer the revealing act of Jesus to the sending of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, which is implied by nothing in the text. Or is John thinking especially of the divine condition of the Logos before His coming to the earth? But that would be to say, that the knowledge of God which Jesus communicated to men was drawn from the recollections of His anterior existence. We cannot admit this. In fact, everything which Jesus revealed on earth concerning God passed through His human consciousness (see on iii. 13, vi. 46). I agree, therefore, in opinion rather with *Lücke,* that this present participle *ὁ ὤν, who is,* refers to the permanent relation of the Son to the Father through all the stages of His divine, human and divine-human existence. He ever presses anew with an equal intimacy into the bosom of the Father, who reveals Himself to Him in a manner suitable to His position and His work at every moment. The form *εἰς κόλπον,* instead of *ἐν κόλπῳ* (the prep. of motion, instead of that of rest), expresses precisely this active and living relation. The bosom of the Father is not a place, but a life; one *is there* only in virtue of a continual moral act. If John substitutes *εἰς* here for *πρός* of ver. 1, this arises simply from the difference between the object *κόλπος, the bosom,* which denotes a thing, and the object *θεόν, God,* which designated a person. The word *τοῦ πατρός, of the Father,* is not merely a paraphrase of the name of God; this term is chosen in order to make the essential contents of the revelation brought by the Son understood. He manifested God *as Father,* and for this He did not need to give speculative teaching; it was enough for Him to show Himself *as Son.* To show in Himself the Son, was the simplest means of showing in God the Father. Thus, by His

filial relation with God, Jesus has initiated earth into the most profound secret of heaven, a secret which the angels themselves perchance did not yet sound completely. Outside of this revelation of the divine character, every idea which man forms of God is incomplete or imaginary—in a certain measure, an *idol*, as John says (1 Ep. v. 20). The pronoun ἐκεῖνος, *he*, has here, as ordinarily in John, a pregnant and even exclusive sense: "he and he alone!" It is impossible to explain the use of this pronoun, as *Weiss* would do, by the contrast with a nearer subject, which would be the Father Himself. The employment of the word ἐξηγεῖσθαι to *explain*, to *make known*, is often explained by the technical use of it which was made by the Greeks, with whom it denoted the explanation of divine things by men charged with this office, the ἐξηγηταί. The simplicity of John's style hardly harmonizes with this comparison, which, besides, is not necessary in order to the explanation of the word. The apostle uses it absolutely, without giving it any complement. It is to the act, rather than its object, that he desires to draw attention, as in the first clause of ver. 16 (*we have received*): "He has declared; really declared!" Every one understands what is the object of this teaching: God first, then in Him all the rest. To reveal God, is to unveil everything.

With this 18th verse we evidently come back to the starting-point of the Prologue, to the idea of ver. 1. Through faith in Christ as only-begotten Son, the believer finds again access to that eternal Word from whom sin (*the darkness*, ver. 5) had held him apart. He obtains anew, in the form of *grace* and *truth* (vv. 16–18), those treasures of life and light, which the Word has spread abroad in the world (ver. 4). Sin's work is vanquished; the communion with heaven is re-established. God is possessed, is known; the destiny of man begins again to be realized. The infinite dwells in the finite and acts through it; the abyss is filled up.

At the same time, these last words of the Prologue form, as *Keil* says, the transition to the narrative which is about to begin. How did Jesus Christ reveal the Father? This is what the story to which the apostle passes from ver. 19 onward is to relate.

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS ON THE PROLOGUE.

I. The Plan.

Three thoughts sum up this remarkable passage and determine its progress: The *Logos* (vv. 1–4); the Logos *unrecognized* (vv. 5–11); the Logos *received* (vv. 12–18). Between the first and second subjects ver. 5 forms the transition, in the same manner as vv. 12, 13 form that between the second and third. Finally, the last verses of the Prologue bring back the mind of the reader to the first words of the passage.

This plan seems to us the only one which is harmony with the apostle's thought. We shall convince ourselves of this by recognizing, in the sequel of this study, the fact that the entire narrative is founded upon

the three factors which have been indicated and that its phases are determined by the appearance, and the successive preponderance of these three essential elements of the history.

II. The Intention of the Prologue.

There are three very different ways of viewing this subject.

1. The *Tübingen School* think that the author proposed to himself to acclimate in the Church the doctrine of the Logos. Finding that speculative idea in the systems of his time, he wished to build the bridge between the Church and the reigning philosophy. And as, in his whole narrative, he had no other aim except to realize this design by illustrating this dominant idea of the Logos, by means of certain acts and discourses more fictitious than real, he did not hesitate to inscribe at the beginning of his book the great thought which forms its synthesis—namely, that of an eternal being intermediate between the infinite God and the finite world.

If it is so, it must be acknowledged that the theorem of the Logos is the end of the work, and that the person of Jesus is nothing more than the means. Is this, indeed, the meaning of this Prologue? Who can think, in comparing ver. 1 and ver. 14, that the second of these verses is there for the sake of the first, and not the reverse? No; the author does not wish to take us on a metaphysical walk in the depths of Divinity, in order to discover there the being called Logos; he wishes to make us feel all the grandeur and all the value of the person and work of Jesus Christ, by showing us in this historical personage the manifestation of the divine Logos. It is not the fact of the incarnation (ver. 14) which is at the service of the thesis of the Logos (ver. 1); it is this thesis which prepares the way for the account of this capital fact of human history. By nothing is the opposition between the speculative intention which Baur ascribes to the Prologue (as to the whole Gospel) and the real aim of this passage, better indicated, than by the explanation which that scholar is obliged to give of ver. 14. To that verse, which is the centre of the whole passage, Baur gives an altogether subordinate place. John does not mean that the Logos becomes incarnate, but simply that He is made visible by a kind of theophany. This fact, according to Baur, has no value for the accomplishing of salvation; it serves only to make us perceive more clearly all its sweetness. This explanation is sufficient to show the contradiction between the thought of the Tübingen professor and that of the evangelist.

II. *Reuss* avoids such an exaggeration; he understands that the historical person of Jesus is the end and that the theory of the Logos can, in any case, be only a means. The author, in possession of the Gospel faith, seeks to give a rational account to himself of his new belief, and for this purpose he undertakes to draw, outside of the Gospel, from the contemporary philosophy an idea capable of becoming for him the key of Jesus' history, and of raising his faith and that of his readers to the full height

of religious speculation. Our Prologue is the initiation of the Church into the true Gnosis. This is also the result of *Lücke's* study. To explain the Prologue thus, whether one wills it or not, is to give up the authenticity of the entire work. For it is impossible to ascribe to an apostle of Jesus such an amalgam of contemporary metaphysics with the conception of the person of his Master. So the author of this explanation has ended, after much hesitation, by placing himself in the number of the adversaries of the authenticity. By a fatality he was obliged to come to this point. There was, indeed, for the Apostle John, if he was really desirous to deposit in a written work the theory of the Logos, which had thrown a clear light for him upon his own faith, a simple means of establishing for the Church this new view. It was that of setting it before the Church in an epistle; there was no need of using for this purpose the means—very equivocal in a moral point of view—of a Gospel narrative.

Reuss regards the procedure which he attributes to the author as unconscious on his part and, consequently, as innocent. But the fact that the author all along avoids putting the word Logos into the mouth of Jesus, clearly proves that he acted with reflection, and that he had the consciousness of not having this name from the lips of Him to whom he applied it. As to the innocence of this matter, history has passed judgment, and its judgment is severe. History says, indeed, that among all the writings of the New Testament, the Gospel of John and particularly the Prologue have especially contributed to establish in the Church *Jesus-worship*, that is to say—from the standpoint of those who think after this manner—a remnant of paganism. Julian the Apostate could well say: "This John who declared that the Word was made flesh must be regarded as the source of all the evil."[1] This is the result of John's speculative desires; he has thrown into the Gospel the leaven of idolatry, corrupted the worship in spirit and truth, and even troubled at its source the purity of the Christian life, for eighteen centuries. Only at the present day does the Church awake from this long infatuation of which he was the author, and return to a sound mind. Thus so far as he is concerned has the Master's promise been verified: "He who heareth you, heareth me!"

When we penetrate the thought of the Prologue we see clearly that the doctrine of the Logos is not to the author's mind superimposed upon his faith, but that it forms the foundation and essence of it. If Jewish unbelief with regard to Jesus was something so monstrous, it is because He was not only the Messiah, but the Word who had come into the midst of His own. If the faith of the Church is so great a privilege for itself, it is because, by uniting it with Jesus, it puts the Church again in communication with the divine source of life and light, with the Word Himself. This Logos-idea, then, belongs to the essence of John's faith; it is no longer for him a *means*, as *Reuss* claims, but an *end*, as *Baur* would have it.

III. This idea was simply a *result*. It was evolved for John from the sum of his reflections on the person of Jesus. He himself describes to

[1] *Cyril, contra Julianum.*

us in ver. 14 the way in which this work was accomplished in him. The Son of God was revealed to him in the person of Jesus through the glory full of grace and truth which distinguished this man from every other man; and he inscribed this discovery at the beginning of his narrative, in order that he might make the reader understand the decisive importance of the history, which was about to pass under his eyes; here is not one of those events which we leave after having read it, that we may pass on to another: "These things have been written, that you may believe, and that believing you may have life" (xx. 31). The question in this history is of eternal life and death; to accept, is to live; to reject, is to perish. This is the *nota bene* by which John opens his narrative and guides the reader.

But why employ so singular a term as Logos?

III. The Idea and Term Logos.

We have here to study three questions: 1. Whence did the evangelist derive the *notion* of the Logos? 2. What is the origin of this *term?* 3. What the reason of its *use?* Having discussed these questions in the Introduction (pp. 173–181), we will notice here only that which has a special relation to the exegetical study which we are about to undertake.

1. First of all we establish a fact: namely, that the Prologue only sums up the thoughts contained in the testimony which Christ bears to Himself in the fourth Gospel. *Weiss*[1] mentions two principal points in which the Prologue seems to him to go beyond the testimony of Christ: 1. The notion of *the Word* by which John expresses the pre-historic existence of Christ; 2. The function of *creator* which is ascribed to Him (ver. 3).

Let us for a moment lay aside the *term* Logos, to which we will return. The creative function is naturally connected with the fact of the eternal existence of the Logos in God. He who could say to God: "*Thou didst love me before the creation of the world,*" certainly did not remain a stranger to the act by which God brought the world out of nothing. How is it possible not to apply here the words of v. 17: "As the Father . . . I also work," and v. 19, 20: "The Father showeth the Son all that he doeth . . . ," and: "Whatsoever things the Father doeth, these doeth the Son in like manner." Add the words of Gen. i. 26: "Let *us* make man in *our* image," to which John certainly alludes in the second clause of ver. 1 of the Prologue. All the other affirmations of this passage rest equally on the discourses and facts related in the Gospel; comp. ver. 4: "*In Him was life . . . ,*" with v. 26: "*As the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself;*" ver. 9: "*There was the true light,*" with viii. 12 and ix. 5: "*I am the light of the world . . . He that followeth me shall have the light of life;*" ver. 7: "*John came to bear witness,*" with i. 34: "*And I have seen, and have borne witness that this is the Son of God,*" and ver. 33: "*Ye have sent unto John, and he hath borne witness to the truth;*"

[1] *Johanneischer Lehrbegriff*, 1862.

what is said of the presence and activity of the Logos in the world in general (ver. 10), and in the theocracy in particular (*to His home, His own*, ver. 11), previous to His incarnation, with what Jesus declares in chap. x. of the Shepherd's voice which is immediately *recognized* by *His sheep*, and this not only by those who are already in the fold of the Old Covenant (ver. 3), but also by those *who are not of that fold* (ver. 16), or what is said of the children of God *scattered throughout the whole world* (xi. 52); the opposition made in the Prologue (ver. 13) between the fleshly birth and the divine begetting, with the word of Jesus to Nicodemus (iii. 6): "*That which is born of the flesh is flesh; that which is born of the Spirit is spirit;*" the notion of Christ's real humanity, so earnestly affirmed in the Prologue (ver. 14), with the perfectly human character of the person and affections of the Saviour in the whole Johannean narrative; He is *exhausted* by fatigue (iv. 6); He *thirsts* (iv. 7); He *weeps* over a friend (xi. 35); He is *moved*, even *troubled* (xi. 33, xii. 27); on the other hand, His glory, *full of grace and truth*, His character as *Son who has come from the Father* (vv. 14–18), with His complete dependence (vi. 38 f.), His absolute docility (v. 30, etc.), His perfect intimacy with the Father (v. 20), the divinity of the works which it was given Him to accomplish, such as: to give life, to judge (v. 21, 22); the perfect assurance of being heard, whatsoever He might ask for (xi. 41, 42); the adoration which He accepts (xx. 28); which He claims even as the equal of the Father (v. 23); the testimony of John the Baptist quoted in ver. 15, with the subsequent narrative (i. 27, 30); the gift of the law, as a preparation for the Gospel (ver. 17), with what the Lord says of His relation to Moses and his writings (v. 46, 47); ver. 18, which closes the Prologue with the saying in vi. 46: "*Not that any one hath seen the Father, except He that is from the Father, He hath seen the Father;*" the terms *Son* and *only-begotten Son*, finally, with the words of Jesus in vi. 40: "*This is the Father's will, that He who beholds the Son . . .;*" iii. 16: "*God so loved the world, that He gave His only-begotten Son,*" and iii. 18: "*Because he hath not believed on the name of the only-begotten Son of God.*" It is clear: the Prologue is an edifice which is constructed wholly out of materials furnished by the words and the facts of Jesus' history. It contains of what is peculiar to John only the idea and term Logos applied to His pre-existent state. It is certainly this term, used in the philosophical language of the time, which has led so many interpreters to transform the author of the Prologue into a disciple of Philo. We shall limit ourselves here to the mentioning of the essential differences which distinguish the God of Philo from the God of John, the Logos of the one from the Logos of the other. And it shall be judged whether the second was truly at the school of the first.

1. The word λόγος, in John, signifies, as in the whole Biblical text, *word*. In Philo, it signifies, as in the philosophical language of the Greeks, *reason*. This simple fact reveals a wholly different starting-point in the use which they make of the term.

2. In Philo, the existence of the Logos is a metaphysical theorem. God being conceived of as the absolutely indeterminate and impersonal being, there is an impassable gulf between Him and the material, finite, varied

world which we behold. To fill this gulf, Philo needed an intermediate agent, a *second God*, brought nearer to the finite; this is the Logos, the half-personified divine reason. The existence of the Logos in John is not the result of such a metaphysical necessity. God is in John, as in all the Scriptures, Creator, Master, Father. He acts Himself in the world, He loves it, He gives His Son to it; we shall even see that it is He who serves as intermediate agent between men and the Son (vi. 37, 44), which is just the opposite of Philo's theory. In a word, in John everything in the relation of the Logos to God is a matter of liberty and of love, while with Philo everything is the result of a logical necessity. The one is the disciple of the Old Testament interpreted by means of Plato and Zeno; the other, of the same Old Testament explained by Jesus Christ.

3. The office of the Logos in Philo does not go beyond the divine facts of the creation and preservation of the world. He does not place this being in any relation with the Messiah and the Messianic kingdom. In John, on the contrary, the creating Logos is mentioned only in view of the redemption of which He is to be the agent; everything in the idea of this being tends towards His Messianic appearance.

4. To the view of Philo, as to that of Plato, the principle of evil is matter; the Jewish philosopher nowhere dreams, therefore, of making the Logos descend to earth, and that in a bodily form. In John, on the contrary, the supreme fact of history is this: "*The Logos was made flesh*," and this is also the central word of the Prologue.

The two points of view, therefore, are entirely different, and are even in many respects the antipodes of each other. Nevertheless, we notice in Philo certain ideas, certain terms, which establish a relation between him and John. How are we to explain this fact?

The solution is easy: it is not difficult to find a common source. John and Philo were both Jews; both of them had been nourished by the Old Testament. Now three lines in that sacred book converge towards the notion of an intermediate being between God and the world.[1] 1. The appearances of *the Angel of the Lord* (*Maleach Jehovah*), of that messenger of God, who acts as His agent in the sensible world, and who sometimes is distinguished from Jehovah, sometimes is identified with Him; comp. e. g. Gen. xvi. 7 with ver. 13; again, Gen. xxxii. 28 with Hos. xii. 4, 5. God says of this mysterious being, Exod. xxiii. 21: "*My name* (my manifested essence) *is in him*." According to the Old Testament (comp. particularly Zech. xii. 10, and Mal. iii. 1), this divine personage, after having been the agent of all the theophanies, is to consummate His office of mediator by fulfilling here on earth the function of Messiah. 2. The description of *Wisdom*, Prov. viii. 22–31; undoubtedly this representation of Wisdom in Proverbs appears to be only a poetic personification, while the Angel of the Lord is presented as a real personality. 3. The active part ascribed to the *Word of the Lord*. This part begins with the creation and continues in the prophetic revelations

[1] See Introd. p. 177.

comp. Ps. cvii. 20; cxlvii. 15, and Is. lv. 11, where the works accomplished by this divine messenger are described.

From the time of the Babylonish captivity, the Jewish doctors united these three modes of divine manifestation and activity in a single conception, that of the permanent agent of Jehovah in the sensible world, whom they designated by the name of *Memra* (Word) *of Jehovah* (מימרא דיהוה).[1] It cannot be certainly determined whether these Jewish learned men established a relation between this Word of the Lord and the person of the Messiah.[2]

This idea of a divine being, organ of the works and the revelations of Jehovah in the sensible world could not, therefore, fail to have been known both by John and by Philo. This is the basis common to the two authors. But from this starting-point their paths diverge. John passing into the school of Jesus, the idea of the Word takes for him a historical significance, a concrete application. Hearing Jesus affirm that He is before Abraham; that the Father loved Him *before the creation of the world*, . . . he applies to Him this idea of the *Word* which in so many different ways strikes its roots into the soil of the Old Testament, while Philo, living at Alexandria, becomes there the disciple of the Greek philosophers, and seeks to interpret by means of their speculations and their formulas the religious ideas of the Jewish religion. We thus easily understand both what these two authors have in common, and what distinguishes them and even puts them in opposition to each other.

[1] Introd. pp. 177, 178.—Along with this expression the terms *Shekinah* (*habitation*) and *Jekara* (*splendor*) are used in the *Targums*, or Chaldaic paraphrases of the O. T. The two oldest, those of Onkelos and Jonathan, were generally regarded as dating from the middle of the first century of our era. Recent works seem to bring the redaction of them down to the third or fourth century; but only the redaction. For a great number of points prove that the materials go back to the apostolic times. We have even proofs of the existence of redactions going back as far as the time of John Hyrcanus. With the Jews everything is a matter of tradition. The redaction in a case like this is only "the completion of the work of ages." Comp. Schürer, *Lehrb. d. neutest. Zeitgesch.* pp. 478, 479.

[2] Perhaps in Palestine there was, from the early times, more inclination to blend together the notion of the Word and the Messianic idea, than at Alexandria. There is in the book of Enoch (of the last part of the second century before Jesus Christ) and in one of the very parts of it which are almost unanimously recognized as the oldest, a remarkable passage, which, if the form in which we have it is the exact reproduction of the original text, would allow no further doubt on this point. The Messiah is there represented (chap. xc. 16–38) as a white bull, which, after having received the worship of all the animals of the earth, transforms all these races into white bulls like itself; after which the poet adds: And the first bull "*was the Word*, and *this word* was a powerful animal which had great black horns on its head [the emblem of the divine omnipotence]" . . . It is thus that Dillmann in his classic work on this book, translates these words. Comp. the remarkable article of M. Wabnitz, *Rev. de Théolog.* July, 1874. The Messianic application of this passage cannot be doubted (see Schürer, *Lehrbuch der neutest. Zeitgesch.*, p. 568). There seems, then, clearly to be an indication here of the relation established in Palestine, from the time anterior to Jesus Christ, between the divine being called *Memra* or *Word* and the person of the Messiah. There is no doubt of the Palestinian origin of the Book of Enoch. The Book of *Wisdom*, which was composed at Alexandria a century before Jesus Christ, speaks of *Wisdom*, personifying it with great emphasis. But it is impossible to discover here (even in chap. vii.) the notion of a real personality, or to recognize in the representation of the persecuted just man in chap. ii. the least allusion to the person of the Messiah.

II. With respect to the term *Word*, frequently used, as it already was, in the Old Testament, then employed in a more theological sense by the Jewish doctors, it must have presented itself to the mind of John as very appropriate to designate the divine being in the person of his Master. What confirms the Palestinian, and by no means Alexandrian, origin of this term, is that it is used in the same sense in the Apocalypse, which is certainly by no means a product of Alexandrian wisdom; comp. Acts xix. 13: "And his name was *the Word of God*." Philo, as he laid hold of this Jewish term Logos, in order to apply it to the metaphysical notion which he had borrowed from Greek philosophy, could not do so without also modifying its meaning and making it signify *reason* instead of *word*. This is what he did in general with regard to all the Biblical terms which his Jewish education had rendered familiar to him, such as *archangel*, *son*, *high-priest*, which he transferred to speculative notions according to the method by which he applied the word *angels* to the *ideas* of Plato.

We see, therefore: it is the same religion of the Old Testament, which, developed on one side in the direction of Christian realism, on the other in that of Platonic idealism, produced these two conceptions of John and of Philo, who differ even more in the central idea than they resemble each other in that which envelops it.

In applying to Jesus the name Word, John did not dream, therefore, of introducing into the Church the Alexandrian speculative theorem which had for him no importance. He wished to describe Jesus Christ as the *absolute revelation* of God to the world, to bring back all divine revelations to Him as to their living centre, and to proclaim the matchless grandeur of His appearance in the midst of humanity.

III. But can the *employment* of this extraordinary term on his part have occurred without any allusion to the use which was made of it all about him in the regions where he composed his Gospel?[1] It seems to me difficult to believe this. Asia Minor, particularly Ephesus, was then the centre of a syncretism in which all the religious and philosophical doctrines of Greece, Persia and Egypt met together. It has been proved that in all those systems the idea of an intermediate divine being between God and the world appears, the *Oum* of the Indians, the *Hom* of the Persians, the *Logos* of the Greeks, the *Memar* of the Jews.[2] If such were the surroundings in the midst of which the fourth Gospel was composed, we easily understand what John wished to say to all those thinkers who were speculating on the relations between the infinite and the finite, namely: "That connecting link between God and man, which you are seeking in the region of the idea, we Christians possess in that of reality, in that of history; we have seen, heard, touched this celestial mediator. Listen and believe! And by receiving Him, you will possess, with us, *grace upon grace*." In introducing this new term into the Christian language, therefore, John had the intention, as *Neander* thought, of opposing to the empty

[1] Comp. Introd., p. 180 f.

[2] Comp. Baumlein, *Versuch die Bedeutung des joh. Logos zu entwickeln*, Tübingen, 1828. (We take our position on the general results of this essay, with pretending to vouch for all its particular citations.)

idealism on which the cultivated and unchristian persons around him were feeding, the life-giving realism of the Gospel history which he was proposing to set forth.[1]

IV. The Truth and Importance of the Teaching of the Prologue Respecting the Person of Jesus Christ.

If the Prologue is the summary of the testimonies which Jesus bore to Himself in the course of His ministry, the teaching of John in this passage can no longer be regarded as the last term of a series of phases by means of which the Christological conception passed into the midst of the Church; it is at once the most normal and the richest expression of the consciousness which Jesus had of His own person. *Renan* is not indisposed to accept this result. Only in this estimation of Himself which Jesus allowed Himself to indulge, he sees the height of self-exaltation. But this explanation is incompatible with the moral character of Jesus. If He overrated Himself even to folly, how are we to understand that inward calm, that profound humility, that unalterably sound judgment, that so profoundly true appreciation of all the moral relations, whether between God and man, or between man and man, which Renan himself recognizes in Him? The kingdom of truth and holiness which has come from the appearance of Jesus is enough to set aside the suspicions of His modern biographer and to decide in the evangelist's favor.

The critic might limit himself to calling in question the historical accuracy of the discourses which John puts into the mouth of Jesus. But we think that we have demonstrated the full confidence which we are obliged to accord to them (Introd., pp. 93–134). They cannot be separated from the facts with which they are closely connected, and these facts are as well, not to say better, guaranteed than those of the Synoptics (Introd., pp. 68–93).

Reuss urges, as an objection, a contradiction between the Prologue, in which the perfect *equality* of the Father and Son (such as ecclesiastical orthodoxy professes) is taught, and the authentic words of Jesus in the Gospel, starting from the idea of the *subordination* of the Son.[2] The exegesis of the Prologue has proved that this contradiction does not exist, since subordination is taught in the Prologue, as clearly as in the discourses. Let us recall the expressions: "*he was with God*," ver. 1; "the only-begotten *Son*," ver. 14; "*who is in the bosom of the Father*," ver. 18; these expressions imply subordination as much as any saying related in the Gospel. Reuss' mistake is that of wishing by all means to identify the conception of the Prologue with the Nicene formulas.

Baur[3] does not believe in the possibility of reconciling the notion of the incarnation with that of the miraculous birth taught in the Synoptics. But if we take this expression, *became flesh*, seriously,—as Baur does not—the alleged contradiction is solved of itself. As in this case the subject of the Gospel hisory is not longer, as Baur claims, the Logos continuing in

[1] *Gesch. d. Pflanzung d. christl. Kirche*, ii. p. 549.

[2] *Hist. de la théol. chrét.*, II., p. 440 f.

[3] *Theol. Jahrb.* 1844, III., p. 24 f.

His divine state, but a true man, the fact of a real birth of this man, whether miraculous or natural, becomes a necessary condition of his human existence.

The most serious objection is derived from the difficulty of reconciling the pre-existence of Christ with His real humanity. Thus *Lücke*,[1] while fully recognizing that there is something dangerous in the rejection of the pre-existence, thinks, nevertheless, that this dogma implies a difference of *essence* between the Saviour and His brethren, which seriously compromises both His character as Son of man, and His redemptive function. *Weizsäcker* takes his position at the same point of view.[2] He acknowledges that the communion of the Son with the Father is not simply moral; that Jesus did not gain His dignity as Son by His fidelity; but that it is, much rather, the presupposition of all that He did and said; that His moral fidelity maintained this original relation, but did not produce it; that, it is the unacquired condition of the consciousness which He had of Himself. On the other hand, he maintains that the superior knowledge which Christ possessed, could not be the continuation of that which He brought from above; for that origin would take away from it the progressive character, limited to the task of each moment, which we recognize in it and which makes it a truly human knowledge. And, as for the moral task of Jesus, it would also lose its truly human character; for where would be the moral conflict in the Son, if He still possessed here below that complete knowledge of the divine plan which He had had eternally in the presence of the Father? There are, therefore, in the fourth Gospel according to this critic, two Christs placed in juxtaposition: the one, truly man, as Jesus Himself teaches in harmony with the Synoptics; the other, divine and pre-existent—the Christ of John. In attempting to resolve this difficulty, we do not conceal from ourselves that we are entering upon one of the most difficult problems of theology. What we shall seek after, in the lines which follow, is not the reconciliation of Scripture with any orthodoxy whatever, but the agreement of Scripture with itself.

The Scriptures, while teaching the eternal existence of the Word, do not, by any means, teach the presence of the divine state and attributes in Jesus during the course of His earthly life. They teach, on the contrary, the complete renouncing by Jesus of that state, with a view to His entrance into the human state. The expression: *the Word was made flesh* (i. 14), speaks of the divine subject only as reduced to the human state; it does not at all, therefore, suppose the two states, divine and human, as co-existent in Him. The *impoverishment* of Christ of which Paul speaks 2 Cor. viii. 9, and His voluntary *emptying of Himself* described in Phil. ii. 6, 7, have no meaning except as we see in this renunciation of the divine state and the entrance into the human mode of existence two facts which were coincident. The Gospel history confirms these declarations. Jesus does not on earth any longer possess the attributes which constitute the divine state. Omniscience He does not have. He Himself declares His

[1] Vol. I., p. 378.

[2] *Jahrb. für deutsche Theol.* VII. 4, p. 639 and 655–664.

ignorance on a particular point (Mark xiii. 32). In our Gospel, also, the expression: "*When he heard* that the Jews had cast him out. . . " (ix. 35), proves the same thing. In general, every question put by Him would have been only a pretence, if He had still possessed omniscience. He possessed a superior prophetic vision, undoubtedly (John iv. 17, 18); but this vision was not omniscience. And I do not think that the facts by any means confirm the opinion of *Weizsäcker*, that John's narrative ascribes to Jesus a knowledge which was a reminiscence of His heavenly knowledge. The exegesis will show that Jesus never enunciated anything whatsoever which did not pass through His human consciousness. No more does He possess omnipotence. For He prays and is heard (xi. 42); as for His miracles, it is the Father who works them on His behalf (v. 36). He is equally bereft of omnipresence. He rejoices in His absence at the time of the sickness of Lazarus (xi. 15). His love, perfect as it is, is nevertheless not divine love. This is immutable; but who will maintain that Jesus in His cradle loved as He did at the age of twelve, and at the age of twelve, as He did on the cross? Relatively perfect, at each given moment, His love increased from day to day, both in intensity and with reference to voluntary self-sacrifice, and in extent and with reference to the circle which it embraced, at first His family, then His people, then the whole of mankind. It was a truly human love. For this reason, St. Paul says: "The grace of one *man*, Jesus Christ" (Rom. v. 15). His holiness was, also, a human holiness; for it was realized at every moment only at the cost of a struggle, through renouncing lawful enjoyment and the victory over the no less lawful dread of pain (xii. 25, 27; xvii. 19 a.). This holiness is so human that it is to pass into us and become ours (xvii. 19 b.). All these texts clearly prove that Jesus did not possess, while on earth, the attributes which constitute the divine state. And, indeed, how could He otherwise terminate His earthly career by asking back again the glory which He had before His incarnation (xvii. 5)?

Can we conceive of such an emptying of Himself on the part of a divine being? *Keil*, while acknowledging that there is here a problem which has not yet been solved, thinks that the emptying of the divine attributes took place through the very fact of the entrance of the subject who possessed them into a more limited nature. *Steinmeyer*, likewise says: The very fact of the entrance into a material body had the effect of reducing to the condition of latency the qualities which befit an absolute personality. We might carry back to this idea the saying of Paul (Phil. ii. 7): "He divested himself (*emptied*), having taken the form of a servant," by making the act expressed in the participle *having taken* the antecedent and condition of that which is expressed by the finite verb: "*he divested himself.*" But we may also conceive of the act of voluntary divesting as preceding the entrance into the human state, and as being the condition of it. And it is rather to this idea, as it seems to me, that the passage in Philippians leads us. However this may be, Scripture does not, by any means, teach that He came to earth with His divine attributes—a fact which implies that He had renounced not only their use, but also their possession.

Even the consciousness of His anterior existence as a divine subject would have been incompatible with the state of a true child and with a really human development. The word which He uttered at the age of twelve years (Luke ii. 49) is alleged; but it simply expresses the feeling which Jesus had already at that age of being entirely devoted to the cause of God, as a well-disposed son is to the interests of his father. With a moral fidelity like His, and in the permanent enjoyment of a communion with God which sin did not impair, the child could call God His Father in a purely religious sense, and without resulting in a consciousness within Him of a divine pre-existence. Certainly the feeling of His redemptive mission must have developed itself from his early age, especially through the experience of the continual contrast between His moral purity and the sin by which He saw all those who surrounded Him affected, even the best of them such as Joseph and Mary. The only one in health in this caravan of sick persons with whom He made His journey, He must early have had a glimpse of His task as physician and have inwardly consecrated Himself wholly to it. But there is in the Gospel history not a word, not an act attributed to Jesus which leads us to suppose in the child or the youth the consciousness of His divine nature, and of His previous existence. It is to the apocryphal gospels that we must go to seek this contra-natural and anti-human Jesus. It was, if we mistake not, on the day of His baptism, when the moment arrived at which He was to begin to testify of Himself, of what He was for God and of what God was for Him and for the world, that God thought it fit to initiate Him into the mystery of His life as Son anterior to His earthly existence. This revelation was contained in the words: "Thou art my Son," which could not refer only to His office as Messiah, since they were explained by the following words: "In thee I am well-pleased." He recovered at that time that *consciousness* of Sonship which He had allowed to become extinguished in Him, as at night, as we surrender ourselves to sleep, we lose self-consciousness; and He was able from that moment to make the world understand the greatness of the gift which was made to it and of the love of which He was the object on God's part.

The following, therefore, as it seems to me, are the constituent elements of this mysterious fact:

1. As man was created *in the image* of God and *for the divine likeness*, the Logos could, without derogation, descend even to the level of a human being and work out His development from that moment in truly human conditions.

2. Receptivity for the divine, aspiration towards the divine, being the distinctive feature of man among the other natural beings, the essential characteristic of the life of the Logos made man must be incessant and growing assimilation to the divine in all its forms.

3. This religious and moral capacity of the Logos having entered into human existence is not to be measured by that which each particular man possesses. Through the fact of His miraculous birth, He reproduces

not the type of a determinate father, but that of the race itself which He represents a second time, as it had been represented the first time by the father of all mankind. In Him, therefore, is concentrated the aspiration of the whole race, the generic and absolute receptivity of humanity for the divine. Hence the incomparable character of this personality, to which all are forced to render homage.

4. Having arrived at the consciousness of His eternal relation to God, the Logos can only aspire to recover the divine *state* in harmony with the consciousness which He has of Himself; but, on the other hand, He is too closely connected with humanity to consent to break the bond which unites Him to it. There remains, therefore, only one thing: to raise humanity with Himself to His glory and thus to realize in it the highest thought of God, that which St. Paul calls "the purpose of the wisdom of God for our glory" (1 Cor. ii. 7), the elevation of man, first, to communion with Christ, and then, in Him, to the possession of the state of the Man-God. This is the accomplishment of the eternal destiny of believers, as St. Paul also states it in Rom. viii. 29, 30.

The course of the development of the earthly life of Jesus is easily understood when we place ourselves at this point of view. By His *birth* as a member of the race, as *Son of man*, humanity finds itself replaced in Him at its normal starting-point; it is fitted to begin anew its development, which sin had perverted. Up to the age of thirty, Jesus accomplishes this task. He elevates humanity in His own person, by His perfect obedience and the constant sacrifice of Himself, from innocence to holiness. He is not yet conscious of Himself; perhaps, in the light of the Scriptures, He begins to have a presentiment of that which He is in relation to God. But the distinct consciousness of His dignity as Logos would not be compatible with the reality of His *human development* and with the accomplishment of the task assigned to this first period of His life. This task being once fulfilled, the conditions of His existence change. A new work opens for Him, and the consciousness of His dignity as well-beloved Son, far from being incompatible with the work which He has still to accomplish, becomes the indispensable foundation of it. Indeed, in order to bear witness of God as Father, He must necessarily know Himself as Son. The *baptism* is the decisive event which opens this new phase.[1] Meeting the aspirations and presentiments of the heart of Jesus, the Father says to Him: "*Thou art my Son.*" Jesus knows Himself from this moment as the absolute object of the divine love. He can say now what He could not have said before: "*Before Abraham was, I am.*" This consciousness of His dignity as Son, the recompense for His previous fidelity accompanies Him everywhere from this hour. It forms the background of all His manifestations in acts and words (see Weizsäcker's fine passage,

[1] Since the time when the Gnostics falsified the meaning of the baptism by making it the epoch of the descent of the divine Æon upon the man Jesus, de Rougemont is the first who has ventured to give to this fact its full significance in the personal development of the Lord (see *Christ et ses témoins*, 7e, 8e, and 9e *lettres*; t. i., pp. 229–296; particularly, pp. 250–255).

pp. 120, 121). Heaven is opened to *Him* and *He testifies of what He sees there.*

The baptism, however, while giving to Jesus His *consciousness* of Sonship, did not give back to Him His *state* of Sonship, His *form of God.* There is still an immense disproportion between that which He *knows* Himself to be and that which He really *is.* Herein, especially, there is for Him the possibility of temptation: "*If thou art the Son of God . . .*" Master of all, He disposes of nothing, and must at every moment address Himself with a believing and filial heart to the paternal heart of God. It is only through the *resurrection* and the *exaltation* which follows it, that His position is placed on the level of the consciousness which He has of Himself, and that He recovers the divine state. Henceforth, *all the fullness of the divinity dwells in Him,* and that humanly, and even, as Paul says, *bodily* (Col. ii. 9). Finally, ten days after His personal assumption into the divine glory, He begins from the day of Pentecost to admit believers to a participation in His state of sonship. He thus prepares the day on which, by His *Parousia,* He will consummate outwardly their participation in His glory, after having re-established in them the perfect holiness which was the basis of His own exaltation. Living images of the Logos from our creation, we shall then realize that type of divine-human existence which we at present behold in Him. Such was the divine plan, such was the last wish of Jesus Himself (John xvii. 24): "*Father, I will that where I am, they also may be with me.*"

The true formula of the incarnation, according to our Gospel, would, therefore, be the following: *That filial communion with God which the Logos realized before His incarnation in the glorious and permanent form of the divine life, He has realized in Jesus since His incarnation in the humble and progressive form of human existence.*[1]

The school of Baur think that they discover an essential difference between John's conception and that of Paul respecting this point. The latter could have seen in the pre-existent Christ only the prototypic *man,* but not a divine being. This view is rested upon 1 Cor. xv. 47: "The first man, derived from the earth, is earthy; the second *man* is from heaven." But this conclusion, which is founded upon no other passage, has really no support in this one. The whole fifteenth chapter of First Corinthians has an eschatological bearing, for it treats of the resurrection of the body. The words cited, therefore, apply to the now glorified Christ, and not to the pre-existent Christ; this is also proved by the words which immediately follow: "*As is the earthly* (Adam), *such are they also that are earthly* (men in their present state): *as is the heavenly* (Christ), *such are they also*

[1] We would not wish to make Gess jointly responsible with us for all the ideas which we here express. We are aware that on some points we are not entirely in accord with him. But the view which we present is nevertheless, in general, that which he has developed in his fine work, *Lehre von der Person Christi,* 1856, which I had the honor of reviewing at the time of its appearance, in a series of articles, *Revue chrétienne,* 1857 and 1858. The first two volumes of the second edition have been already published. Let us hope that the closing part of the work will soon appear.

that are heavenly (the believers risen from the dead). *For as we have borne the image of the earthly, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly.*" Certainly, Paul does not mean to say that we shall bear the image of the pre-existent Christ, but that of the Christ as man raised from the dead and glorified. Even the term *second* (*man*) would be sufficient to prove this; since the pre-existent Christ would be the *first* Adam, the *Adam Kadmon* of Jewish theology. The idea which Baur finds in this passage is, moreover, incompatible with two other expressions of the same epistle, in which two divine functions, the creation of the universe and the leading of Israel through the wilderness, are ascribed to the pre-existent Christ (viii. 6 and x. 4). These functions surpass the idea of a mere heavenly *man*.

When Paul calls Christ "*the image* of the invisible God," "the first-born before every creature," the one "in whom all things have been created and all things subsist" (Col. i. 15, 16), he says exactly what John says, when he calls Him *the Word* (the image of the invisible thought), and when he adds: "All things were made by Him, and nothing which has been made was made without Him." The two terms, *image* and *Word*, express, under two different figures, the same notion: God affirming with an affirmation which is not a simple *verbum volens*, but a living person, all that He thinks, all that He wills, all that He loves that is most perfect, giving thus in this being the word of His thought, the reflection of His being, the end of His love, almost *His realized ideal*. Let us picture to ourselves an artist capable of giving life to the master-piece of his genius, and entering into personal relation with this child of his thought; such is the earthly representation of the relation between God and the Word. This word is *divine;* for the highest affirmation of God cannot be less than God Himself. It is *eternal;* for God cannot have begun at any time to affirm Himself. It is *single;* for it is His absolute *saying*, the perfect enunciation of His being, consequently His primordial sovereign utterance, in which are included, in advance, all His particular sovereign utterances which will re-echo successively in time. It is, accordingly, this Word who, in his turn, will call forth all beings. They will be His free affirmation, as He is Himself that of God. He will display in the universe, under the forms of space and time, all the riches of the divine contents which God has eternally included in Him. The creation will be the poem of the Son to the glory of the Father.

This notion of the Word, as a creative principle, has the greatest importance as related to the conception of the universe. The universe rests thereby on an absolutely luminous basis, which secures its final perfection. Blind and eternal matter, fatal necessity, are banished from a world which is the work of the Word. The ideal essence of all things is absolutely protected by this view.[1]

[1] See *Lange, Leben Jesu*, iv. pp. 553–556. We do not think it necessary here to treat of the questions which are raised, with regard to the internal relations of the divine persons, by the view which we have just set forth touching the fact of the incarnation. Precisely because the existence of the Son is a matter of love, and not of necessity (as with

The notion of the person of Christ which is contained in the Prologue is of decisive importance for the Church.

If the supreme dignity ascribed to Jesus is denied Him, however worthy of admiration this Christ may be, humanity may and should always "*look for another;*" for the path of progress is unlimited. The gate thus remains open for one who comes afterward: "I am come in my Father's name, and ye receive me not; another shall come in his own name, and him ye will receive" (v. 43).

But if in Jesus the Word was really made flesh, there is no higher one to be looked for. The perfect revelation and communication of God are accomplished; eternal life has been realized in time; there is nothing further for every man but to accept and live, or to reject and perish.

We understand, therefore, why John has placed this preamble at the head of his narrative. Faith is not faith—that is to say, absolute, without reserve—except so far as it has for its object that beyond which it is impossible to go.

Philo), there is nothing, when the Word descends to the world to become Himself one of the beings of the universe, to prevent the Father's ability to enter directly into relation with the world, and to exercise in it the functions of creator and preserver which He ordinarily exercises by the intermediate agency of the Word. No doubt, the Word has life in Himself and communicates it to the world, but because the Father *has given Him* this privilege; thus everything proceeds always from the Father (John v. 26).

FIRST PART.

FIRST MANIFESTATIONS OF THE WORD.—BIRTH OF FAITH.—FIRST SYMPTOMS OF UNBELIEF.

I. 19–IV. 54.

As compared with the two parts which are to follow, of which one specially traces out the development of *unbelief* (v.–xii.), the other, that of *faith* (xiii.–xvii.), this First Part has a character which may be called neutral. It serves as the starting-point for the two others. It contains the first revelations of the *object* of faith and unbelief, of Jesus as *Son of God*. Jesus is declared to be the Messiah and Son of God by John the Baptist; a first group of disciples is formed about Him. His glory beams forth in some miraculous manifestations within the circle of His private life. Then He inaugurates His public ministry in the temple, at Jerusalem. But this attempt having failed, He limits Himself to teaching, while performing miracles and collecting about Himself adherents by means of baptism. Finally, observing that, even in this more modest form, His activity gives umbrage to the dominant party at Jerusalem, He withdraws into Galilee, after having sowed by the way the germs of faith in Samaria. This summary justifies the title which we give to this First Part, and the more general character which we ascribe to it as compared with those which follow.

The evangelist himself seems to have wished to divide it into two cycles by the distinctly marked correlation between the two remarks, ii. 11 and iv. 54, which are placed, one at the end of the story of the wedding at Cana: "*This was the beginning of Jesus' miracles which took place at Cana in Galilee; and He manifested His glory, and His disciples believed on Him;*" the other, which closes this whole Part, after the healing of the nobleman's son, "*Again, Jesus did this second miracle when He came from Judea into Galilee.*" By the manifest correlation of these two sentences the evangelist calls attention to the fact that there were, in this first period of Jesus' ministry, two sojournings in Judea, each of which terminated with a return to Galilee, and that both of these returns were alike marked by a miracle performed *at Cana*. This indication of the thought of the historian should be our guide. Accordingly, we divide this Part into two cycles —the one comprising the facts related i. 19–ii. 11; the other, the narratives ii. 12–iv. 54. In the first, Jesus, introduced into His ministry by

John the Baptist, fulfills it without as yet going out of the inner circle of His first disciples and His family. The second relates His first steps in His public ministry.

FIRST CYCLE.

I. 19–II. 11.

This cycle comprises three sections: 1. The testimonies borne by John the Baptist to Jesus, i. 19–37; 2. The first personal manifestations of Jesus and the faith of His first disciples, i. 38–52; 3. His first miraculous sign, ii. 1–11. The facts related in these three sections fill a week which forms, as *Bengel* has remarked, the counterpart of the final Passion-week. The one might be called the week of the betrothal of the Messiah to His people; the other the time of the absolute rupture long since announced by Jesus: "*When the bridegroom shall be taken away, then shall the friends of the bridegroom fast.*"

FIRST SECTION.

I. 19–37.

The Testimonies of John the Baptist.

These testimonies are three in number and were given on three successive days (see vv. 29, 35, "*the next day*)." These three days, eternally memorable for the Church, had left on the heart of the evangelist an ineffaceable impression. On the first he had heard that solemn declaration made before a deputation of the Sanhedrim: The Messiah is present! (ver. 26); and this word, no doubt, had thrilled him as it had the multitude who were there. The next day, the forerunner, pointing out Jesus, had changed his first declaration into that still more important one: Behold Him! and faith in Jesus, prepared for on the preceding day, had illuminated with its first ray the heart of John and that of the Baptist's hearers. Finally, on the third day, by repeating his declaration of the day before, the Baptist evidently meant to say: *Follow Him!* John immediately leaves the Baptist, to attach himself to the new Master whom he points out to him.

Why did the author make the first of these three days the starting-point for his narration? If his intention was to make us witness the opening, not only of his own faith and that of the apostles, but of faith itself in the midst of mankind, he could not choose another starting-point. The Messiah *announced*, then *pointed out*, then *followed;* this certainly is the normal beginning of such a narrative.

I.—*First Testimony:* vv. 19–28.

In unfolding in the Prologue the contents of faith, the apostle had adduced two testimonies of John the Baptist (vv. 6–8 and ver. 15); the second contains, as *Baur* well says, "the idea of the absolute pre-

existence of the Messiah," and consequently the true thought of the author—that of the divinity of Christ. But when was the testimony, cited at ver. 15, given? This is what the apostle proceeds to relate.

Ver. 19. "*And this is the testimony which John gave when*[1] *the Jews sent*[2] *priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask him, Who art thou?*" It is quite strange to see a narrative beginning with the word *and*. This fact is explained by the relation which we have just indicated between ver. 19 and ver. 15. What gives an especial importance to this declaration of John the Baptist, is its official character. It was uttered in presence of a deputation of the Sanhedrim, and as a reply to a positive inquiry emanating from that body, the religious head of the Jewish nation. The Sanhedrim, of whose existence we find the first traces only in the times of Antipater and Herod (Josephus, *Antiq.* xiv. 9, 4), was undoubtedly the continuation or renewal of a very ancient institution. We are reminded of the tribunal of the seventy-two elders established by Moses (Num. xi. 16). Under Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. xix. 8), mention is also made of a supreme tribunal sitting at Jerusalem and composed of a certain number of Levites, priests and fathers of Israel. Comp., perhaps, also Ezek. viii. 11 f., "*seventy men of the elders of Israel.*" In Maccabees (1 Macc. xii. 5; 2 Macc. i. 10; iv. 44, etc.), the body called γερουσία, *senate*, plays a part analogous to that of these ancient tribunals, yet without the possibility of establishing a historic continuity between these institutions. At the time of Jesus, this senate, called *Sanhedrim*, was composed of 71 members, including the president (Tract. *Sanhedr.* i. 6). These members were of three classes: 1. The *chief-priests* (ἀρχιερεῖς), a term which probably designates the high-priests who had retired from office, and the members chosen from the highest priestly families; 2. The *elders* of the people (πρεσβύτεροι, ἄρχοντες τοῦ λαοῦ), a term which undoubtedly comprehends the other members in general, whether lay members or Levites; 3. The *scribes* (γραμματεῖς), a term designating especially the experts in the law, the jurists by profession. The high-priest was *ex-officio* the president.[3] The Sanhedrim had up to this time closed its eyes to John the Baptist's work. But observing that things were daily taking a more serious turn, and that the people were beginning even to ask themselves whether John were not the Christ (comp. Luke iii. 15), they felt at length that they must use their authority and officially present to him the question respecting his mission. Jesus alludes to this step (v. 33); afterwards, He Himself answered a similar inquiry with a refusal (Matt. xxi. 23 f.). The Mishna says expressly: "The judgment of a *tribe*, of a *false prophet* and of a *high-priest* belongs to the tribunal of the seventy-one." *Sanh.* i. 5. We meet here, for the first time, the title, "*the Jews*," which plays an important part in the fourth Gospel. This name,

[1] Origen reads τοτε (*then*) once, elsewhere οτε (*when*).

[2] B. C. Itallq Syr. and other Vss. add after απεστειλαν: προς αυτον (*to him*), words which ℵ A X place after λευιτας.

[3] The old opinion, according to which the Sanhedrim had an elective president and vice-president (the *Nasi* and the *Av-Beth-Din*), seems now to have been thoroughly refuted by *Kuenen* and *Schürer*. See Schürer's *Lehrbuch der Zeitgesch.*, § 23.

by its etymology, properly designates only the members of the tribe of Judah; but after the return from the captivity it is applied to the whole people, because the greater part of the Israelites who returned to their own land belonged to this tribe. It is in this general sense that we find it in ii. 6, "*After the Jews' manner of purifying;*" ii. 13, "*The passover of the Jews;*" iii. 1, "*One of the rulers of the Jews.*" In this purely political sense, this term may even include the Galileans (vi. 52). But the name has most frequently in our Gospel a religious coloring. It designates the nation as an unbelieving community, which, in the majority of its members and through its authorities, had rejected the Messiah. This particular sense is explained by the history; for the focus of the hatred and rejection of Jesus was found at Jerusalem and in Judea. This unfavorable sense attached to the name *the Jews* in our Gospel, has been adduced for the purpose of proving that the author of this book could not have been himself of Jewish origin.[1] But after the fall of Jerusalem the Jewish nation had ceased to exist as a political body; this name of Jews thus became a purely religious title; and as John himself belonged to a different religious community, it is quite natural that he speaks of them as people who were henceforth foreigners to him. The Jewish-Christian author of the Apocalypse expresses himself still more severely with respect to his old fellow-countrymen, when he calls them "the Synagogue of Satan" (iii. 9); and Mark, in spite of his Jewish origin, also designates them by this word, the Jews, absolutely as John does (vii. 3). The words: *from Jerusalem* depend, not on the substantive *the Jews*, but on the verb *sent*. The design of this limiting phrase is to make the solemnity of the proceeding appear; it had an official character, because it emanated from the centre of the theocracy. *Levites* were joined with the priests. It has been often supposed that they merely played the part of bailiffs. But, in several passages of the Old Testament (2 Chron. xvii. 7–9; xxxv. 3; Neh. viii. 7), we see that it was the Levites who were charged with instructing the people in the law, from which fact *Hengstenberg* has, not without reason, concluded, that the scribes, so frequently mentioned in the New Testament, generally belonged to this order, and that it is in this character, and consequently as members of the Sanhedrim, that some of their number figured in the deputation. The question which they address to John the Baptist relates to the expectation, prevailing at that epoch in Israel, of the Messiah and of the extraordinary messengers who, according to the popular opinion, were to precede His coming. "*Who art thou?*" signifies in the context, Art thou one of these expected personages, and what one? We shall see in ver. 25 what embarrassment this question was preparing for John, in case he refused to declare his title.

Origen thought that with the second clause of ver. 19 (ὅτε ἀπέστειλεν) a new testimony of John the Baptist began. The first was, according to him, that of ver. 15 f, to which ver. 19 *a* refers. Consequently, he appears

[1] *Fischer, Tübingen Zeitschrift*, 1840, and so *Hilgenfeld*. We have refuted this objection in the Introd.

to have read τότε, *then*, instead of ὅτε (*when*). To complete this series of misconceptions, he only needed to find further on a third testimony addressed to a new deputation; he succeeded in this through his interpretation of ver. 24 (see on that verse). *Cyril* and some modern writers begin with the *when* of ver. 19 a new sentence, of which the principal clause is found in ver. 20: "When the Jews sent. . . . he declared." But the καί, *and*, before the verb ὡμολόγησε, *he declared*, renders this construction inadmissible. The particle καί, *and*, is never in John the sign of the apodosis, not even in vi. 57. The words πρὸς αὐτόν, *to him*, which are added by a portion of the Alexandrian authorities, and which two Mjj. place after λευίτας, are probably interpolated. *Meyer* and *Weiss* wrongly make καὶ ὡμολόγησε, *and he declared*, depends on ὅτε, *when*; this construction makes the sentence a dragging one. It is better to translate: "And this is the testimony . . . (ver. 19) . . . and he declared."

Ver. 20. "*And he confessed, and denied not, and confessed:*[1] *I am not the Christ.*"[2] Before pointing out the contents of the response of John the Baptist, the evangelist sets forth its characteristics: it was ready, frank, categorical. The first *he confessed*, indicates spontaneity, eagerness. By the negative form: *he denied not*, the evangelist means to say he did not for an instant yield to the temptation which he might have had to deny. The second *he confessed* is added in order to connect with it the profession which is to follow. This remarkable form of narrative (comp. i. 7, 8) seems to us, whatever *Weiss* may say of it, to be more naturally explained if we suppose an allusion to people who were inclined to give to the person of John the Baptist an importance superior to his real dignity. According to the reading of the Alexandrian authorities and Origen, we must translate: "*It is not I* who am the Christ (ἐγὼ οὐκ εἰμί)." This reply would have been suitable, if the question had been, "*Is it thou* who art the Christ?" But the question is merely, "*Who art thou?*" and the true response is consequently that which is found in the T. R. following the Byzantine authorities: "I am not *the Christ* (οὐκ εἰμί ἐγώ)," that is, "I am indeed something, but not the Christ."

Ver. 21. "*And they asked him: what then?*[3] *Art thou*[4] *Elijah? And he said I am not. Art thou the prophet? And he answered, No.*" Some interpreters understand the question τί οὖν (*what then?*) in the same or nearly the same sense as the preceding: "If thou art not the Christ, *what art thou then?*" But the two following questions: "*Art thou Elias . . . ?*" would imply τίς rather than τί in this sense. *De Wette* sees in these words an adverbial expression: "*What then!*" This sense is pointless. We must, rather, supply ἐστί, with *Meyer*: "What then is the case? What extraordinary thing, then, is happening?" This form of question betrays impatience. There was, indeed, in the unprecedented behavior of John the Baptist something which seemed to indicate an exceptional condition.

[1] D omits και, and ℵ Syr^{cur} Or. the second και ωμολογησεν.

[2] ℵ A B C L X Δ It^{plerique} Cop. Or. (3 times) read εγω ουκ ειμι, while Γ Λ and 9 other Mjj. Syr^{sch} and T. R. place ουκ ειμι before εγω.

[3] B reads συ ουν τι (*what art thou then?*), instead of τι ουν (*what then?*)

[4] ℵ B L reject συ after ει.

Malachi had announced (iv. 5) the coming of Elijah as the one preparing for the great Messianic day, and we know from Justin's *Dialogue* with Trypho the Jew, that, according to a popular opinion, the Messiah was to remain hidden until he had been pointed out and consecrated by this prophet. Several passages of the Gospels (Matt. xvi. 14; Mk. vi. 15) prove that there was, besides this, an expectation of the reappearance of some other prophet of the ancient times, Jeremiah for example. Among these expected personages, there was one who was especially called *the prophet.* Some distinguished him from the Messiah (John vii. 40, 41); others confounded him with the Messiah (vi. 14). The question was, evidently, as to the personage announced by Moses ("a prophet like unto me"), in the promise in Deut. xviii. 18. Of course, the people did not picture to themselves a second Elijah or a new Moses in the spiritual sense, as when the angel says of John the Baptist (Luke i. 17), "*He shall go in the spirit and power of Elijah.*" It was the person himself who was to reappear in flesh and bones. How could John the Baptist have affirmed, in this literal sense, his identity with the one or the other of these ancient personages? On the other hand, how could he enter into the domain of theological distinctions? Besides, this mode of discussion would be scarcely in accordance with his character. His reply, therefore, must be negative.

Vv. 22, 23. "*They said then to him, Who art thou? that we may give an answer to those who sent us. What sayest thou of thyself?* 23. *He said, I am a voice crying in the wilderness: Make straight the way of the Lord, as said the prophet Isaiah.*" The deputies have now exhausted the suppositions which were furnished by the accepted Messianic programme of their time. Nothing remains for them but to propose to John again the question which shall make him abandon the negative attitude to which he is limiting himself: "*Who art thou?*" that is to say, "*What personage art thou?*" For his extraordinary conduct must be occasioned by an exceptional mission. John replies to it by a passage from Isaiah, which contains at once the explanation asked for and the guarantee of his mission. The sense of the prophetic passage is this: Jehovah is on the point of appearing in order to manifest His glory. At the moment which precedes His appearance, without the appearing of any person on the scene, a voice is heard which invites Israel to make straight the way by which the Lord is to come. The question in this description is not of the return from the captivity, but of the *Messianic* appearance of Jehovah. As in the East, before the arrival of the sovereign, the roads are straightened and leveled, so Israel is to prepare for its divine King a reception worthy of Him; and the function of the mysterious voice is to engage her in carrying out this work of preparation, lest the signal grace of which she is to be the object may turn into judgment. John applies to himself so much more willingly these words of Isaiah, because it fully accords with his desire to put his own person into obscurity and to let nothing but his message appear: "*A voice.*" The words *in the wilderness* can be referred, in Hebrew as in Greek, either to the verb *to cry*, or to the verb *to make straight.* As regards the sense, it amounts to the same thing, since the order sounds forth in the place where

it is to be executed. The reference to the preceding verb is more natural, especially in the Greek. The *wilderness* designates in the East uncultivated lands, the vast extents of territory which serve for pasturage, and which are crossed by winding paths, and not by roads worthy of a sovereign. Such is the emblem of the moral state of the people; the royal way by which Jehovah is to enter is not yet prepared in their hearts. The feeling of national repentance is still wanting. The sojourning of the forerunner in the wilderness indicated clearly, through this literal conformity to the prophetic emblem, the *moral* accomplishment of the prophecy. Does the formula of citation, "*as said*," also belong to the reply of the Baptist? Or is it a remark of the evangelist? What makes us incline to the first alternative is, that the forerunner had more need of legitimating himself than the evangelist had of legitimating him so long afterwards. To reply as John does was to enunciate his commission, and to declare his orders. It was to say, in fact, to these deputies, experts in the knowledge of the law and the prophets, that, if he was not *personally* one of the expected ancient personages, his mission was, nevertheless, in direct connection with the approaching manifestation of the Messiah. This was all which the Sanhedrim and the people practically needed to know.

The inquiry had borne, at first, upon the *office* of John the Baptist. The deputation completed it by a more special interrogation respecting the rite of *baptism*, which he is allowing himself to introduce into the theocracy without the authorization of the Sanhedrim. The evangelist prepares the way for this new phase of the conversation by a remark having reference to the religious character of the members of the deputation.

Ver. 24. "*And those who*[1] *were sent were of the Pharisees.*" We translate according to the T. R., which is in conformity with the majority of the Mjj., with the Mnn., and with the greater part of the Vss. According to this reading, the participle ἀπεσταλμένοι, *sent*, is defined by the article οἱ, *the*; it is the subject of the sentence. The design of this remark added here by John is easily understood; it is to explain the question which is to follow. John likes to supply in this way, as a narrative progresses, the circumstances, omitted at first, which serve gradually to explain it; comp. i. 41, 45; iv. 30; ix. 14; xi. 5, 18; xiii. 23, etc. The Pharisees were the ultra conservatives in Israel; no one could have been shocked more than they by the innovation which John the Baptist had taken it upon himself to make in introducing baptism. Lustrations undoubtedly formed a part of the Jewish worship. It is even maintained that the pagan proselytes were subjected to a complete bath, on occasion of their passing over to Judaism. But the application of this symbol of entire pollution to the members of the theocratic people was so strange an innovation, that it must have awakened in the highest degree the susceptibility of the authorities who were guardians of the rites, and very particularly that of the party most attached to tradition. The Pharisaic element also was the

[1] ℵ A B C L and Orig. reject οι (*the*) before απεσταλμενοι (*sent*).

main one in the deputation which the Sanhedrim had chosen. We see how skillfully the plan of the examination had been laid; first of all, the question relative to the mission; then, that which concerned the rite; for the latter depended on the former. Nothing can be more simple than the course of the narrative, as thus understood. This mode of explaining the intention of the remark in ver. 24 appears to me more natural than that of *Weiss* and *Keil*, according to which John would thereby characterize the spirit of unbelief which animated the interrogators of the Baptist. The fact of their unbelief not being noticed in the narrative, did not demand explanation. Opposed to the reading of the T. R. there is another supported by the Alexandrian authorities and by Origen, and adopted by *Tischendorf*, and *Westcott and Hort*, which rejects the article οἱ before ἀπεσταλμένοι; the meaning is: "and they had been sent from the Pharisees," or, as Origen understood it: "and there were persons sent (come) from the Pharisees," as if the question were of another deputation than that of ver. 19. Neither the one nor the other of these meanings is possible. For the Pharisees did not form an officially constituted body, from which a proceeding like this which is here spoken of could have started. The Alexandrian reading is, therefore, indefensible, as, in this instance, *Weiss* and *Keil* themselves acknowledge. It is, probably, as is so frequently the case, an arbitrary correction by Origen, to serve his false interpretation of this whole passage, from the end of the Prologue. *Weiss* and *Keil* see here a mere case of negligence of a copyist arising from the preceding καί, in which the οἱ was lost. But how many similar errors should we not have, in that case, in the New Testament!

Ver. 25. "*And they asked him and*[1] *said unto him; why baptizest thou then, if thou art not the Christ, nor*[2] *Elijah, nor*[2] *the prophet.*" The strictest guardians of rites conceded, indeed, to the Messiah or to one of His forerunners the right of making innovations in the matter of observances; and if John had declared himself one of these personages, they would have contented themselves with asking for his credentials, and would have kept silence respecting his baptism, sufficiently legitimated by his mission. In fact, it seems to follow from this verse itself that, on the foundation of words such as those of Ezek. xxxvi. 25, 26, and Zech. xiii. 1, a great national lustration was expected as an inauguration of the kingdom of the Messiah. But John the Baptist having expressly declined the honor of being one of the expected prophets, the deputation had the right to say to him: "Why *then* dost thou baptize?" According to the reading of the T. R. *nor, nor*, the thought is this: "The supposition that John is the Christ is set aside; there remains, therefore, no other way of explaining his baptism except that he is *either* the one *or* the other of the two expected forerunners; now he declares that he is *neither* the one *nor* the other; why then . . . etc. This delicate sense of the *disjunctive* negative was not understood; hence, in our view, the Alexandrian reading *οὐδέ, οὐδέ, nor*

[1] ℵ rejects ηρωτησαν αυτον και (the copyist has confounded the two και).

[2] Instead of ουτε ουτε, which the T. R. reads after most of the Mjj. and Mnn., ουδε ουδε is read in A B C L and Orig. (6 times).

even, which puts the three cases on a common level. The partisans of the Alexandrian text (*Weiss*, *Keil*, *Westcott*, etc.), judge otherwise. The position of John the Baptist, in presence of this question and after his previous answer, became a difficult one. His interrogators, indeed, had counted on this result.

Vv. 26, 27. "*John answered them saying, Yea, I baptize with water;*[1] *in the midst of you*[2] *there standeth*[3] *one whom you know not; 27. He*[4] *who comes after me—but who was before me*[5]*—the latchet of whose sandal I am not worthy to loose.*" This reply has been regarded as not very clear and as embarrassed. *De Wette* even thinks that it does not correspond altogether with the question proposed. The generally adopted explanation is the following: "My baptism with water does not, in any case, encroach upon that of the Messiah, which is of an altogether superior nature; it is only preparatory for it." John would in some sort excuse his baptism by trying to diminish it, and by reminding them that beyond this ceremony the Messianic baptism maintains the place which belongs to it. But, first of all, this would be to evade the question which was put; and the criticism of de Wette would remain a well-founded one. For the baptism of John was attacked in itself and not as being derogatory to that of the Messiah. Then, the words ἐν ὕδατι, *with water*, should be placed at the beginning: "It is *only with water* that I baptize," and the baptism of the Spirit would necessarily be mentioned in the following clause, as an antithesis. Finally, it would scarcely be in harmony with the character of the Baptist to shelter himself under the insignificance of his office and to present his baptism as an inoffensive novelty. This reply, properly understood, is, on the contrary, full of solemnity, dignity, even threatening; it makes apparent the importance of the present situation, into the mystery of which John alone, until now, is initiated. "The Messiah is present: this is the reason why I baptize!" If the Messianic time has really come, and he is himself charged with inaugurating it, his baptism is thereby justified (see ver. 23). This feeling of the gravity of the situation and of the importance of his part is expressed in the ἐγώ, *I*, placed at the beginning of the answer, the meaning of which, as the sequel proves, is this: "*I* baptize with water, and in acting thus I know what I do: for *He* is present who . . ." We have given the force of this pronoun by the affirmation *Yea!* The ἐγώ, *I*, is ordinarily contrasted with the Messiah, by making an antithesis between the baptism of water and the baptism of the Spirit. But this latter is not even mentioned, and this interpretation results from a recollection of the words of the Baptist in the Synoptics. Hence also probably came the introduction of the particle δέ, *but* (in what follows

[1] ℵ alone: εν τω υδατι instead of εν υδατι.

[2] After μεσος the T. R. reads δε (*but*) with all the authorities, except ℵ B C L and Orig. (10 times) who reject this word.

[3] B L T[b] στηκει (*stat*); ℵ G: εστηκει (*stabat*); T. R. with all the rest εστηκεν (*stat*).

[4] T. R. reads after οιδατε, αυτος εστιν (*it is he*) with 13 Mjj., the Mnn., It.Vg. Syr. Orig.(once); these words are rejected by ℵ B C L T[b] Syr[cur] and Orig. (6 times). The art. ο before ερχομενος is omitted by ℵ B Orig.

[5] After ερχομενος T. R. adds ος εμπροσθεν μου γεγονεν (*who has become before me*) with the same authorities as above; these words are rejected by the authorities which reject αυτος εστι (*it is he*).

after the word μέσος), which is rightly omitted by the Alexandrian authorities. It is precisely *because* he knows that the Messiah is present among them, that he baptizes with water and that he has the right to do so. This reply, accompanied as it undoubtedly was, with a significant look cast upon the crowd, in which the mysterious personage of whom he was thinking could be found, must have produced a profound sensation among his hearers. The two readings ἔστηκεν and στήκει, although one is in the perfect and the other in the present, have the same sense: *He stands there.* The important words are these: *Whom you know not.* The word *you* contrasts John's hearers, who are still ignorant, with John himself, who already knows. This expression necessarily assumes that, at the time when the forerunner was speaking, the baptism of Jesus was already an accomplished fact. For it was by means of that ceremony that, in conformity with the divine promise (ver. 33), the person of the Messiah was to have been pointed out to him. In vv. 31 and 33, He Himself affirms that, up to the moment of the baptism, he did not know Him. It is impossible, then, to place the baptism of Jesus, with *Olshausen* and *Hengstenberg*, on this same day or the next, with *Bäumlein*, between ver. 28 and ver. 29, or, with *Ewald*, between ver. 31 and ver. 32. Moreover, this testimony, whatever *Weiss* may say of it, is wholly different from the preachings of John which are reported in the Synoptics, and which had preceded the baptism of Jesus. The very terms which the forerunner here employs contain a very clear allusion to previous declarations in which he had announced a personage who was to follow him; this is especially evident if we read ὁ before ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος, "*the one coming after me* whom I have announced to you." This testimony has an altogether new character: "The Messiah is *present*, and I *know* him." This is the first declaration which refers personally to Jesus; it is for his hearers the true starting-point of faith in *Him.* The words *it is he* (αὐτός ἐστιν), omitted by the Alexandrian authorities, sometimes omitted and sometimes read by Origen, are not indispensable, and may have been added either by copyists who wrongly identified this testimony with that of ver. 15 (οὗτος ἦν), or by others who wished to bring out better the allusion to the previous testimonies related by the Synoptics.

It is otherwise with the words, *who was before me*, which the Alexandrian authorities, Origen and the Curetonian Syriac omit, but which 15 Mjj. and the two ancient versions, *Itala* and *Peschito*, read. The relation between this testimony and that of ver. 30, which will follow, renders these words indispensable in ver. 27. For in ver. 30, John reproduces expressly ("*he it is of whom I said* [yesterday]"), the testimony of ver. 27, and not, as is imagined, that of ver. 15, which is itself only a quotation of our ver. 30 (see on ver. 15). The first day, John uttered, without yet designating Jesus, the declaration of vv. 26, 27; the second day, he repeated it, as it is related in ver. 30, this time applying it to Jesus as present. *Gess* rightly says, "If the *shorter* reading of ver. 27 were the true one, the evangelist would refer in ver. 30 to a fact which had not been related by him" (i. p. 345). These

words: *who was before me*, are, in ver. 27, a sort of parenthesis inserted by the forerunner: "Come after me? Yes, and yet in reality, my predecessor!" (See on ver. 15). By the expression "to loose the latchet of the sandals," John means to designate the humble office of a slave. On the pleonasm of οὗ and αὐτοῦ *Bäumlein* rightly says: "imitation of the Hebrew construction." Philologues discuss the question whether the form ἄξιος ἵνα implies a weakening of the sense of the conjunction ἵνα, which becomes here, according to some, a simple paraphrase of the infinitive (*worthy to loose*), so Bäumlein, or whether this conjunction always retains the idea of purpose (*Meyer*). *Bäumlein* rests upon the later Greek usage and on the νά of the modern Greek, which, with the verb in the subjunctive mood, supplies the place of the infinitive. Nevertheless, we hold, with Meyer, that the idea of purpose is never altogether lost in the ἵνα of the New Testament; he who is worthy of doing a thing, is, as it were, intended *to* do it.

Ver. 28. "*These things were done at Bethany,*[1] *beyond the Jordon,*[2] *where John was baptizing.*" The notice of ver. 28 is certainly not suggested to John by a geographical interest; it is inspired by the solemnity of this whole scene, and by the extraordinary gravity of this official testimony given in presence of the representatives of the Sanhedrim as well as of the entire nation. It was, indeed, to this declaration that the expression of the Prologue applied: "*in order that all might believe through him.*" If the people had been ready for faith, this testimony coming from such lips, would have been enough to make the divine fire break forth in Israel.—As for the two readings *Bethany* and *Bethabara*, Origen relates that nearly all the ancient MSS. read *Bethany*, but that, having sought for a place of this name on the banks of the Jordan, he had not found it, while a place was pointed out called Bethabara (comp. Judg. vii. 24), where tradition alleged that John had baptized. It is, therefore, certain that the reading *Bethabara* was substituted for the primitive reading *Bethany* in a certain number of documents, and that it was under the influence of Origen; as the Roman war had caused a large number of ancient places to disappear even as to their names, we may easily understand the disappearance of Bethany at the time of Origen. We must, therefore, conclude from the text which is established by evidence, that there existed in the time of Jesus, in the vicinity of the Jordan, a place by the name of Bethany, which was consequently different from the city of this name near Jerusalem. As there were two Bethlehems, two Antiochs, two Ramas, two Canas, why should there not have been, also, two Bethanies? Perhaps this name had, in the two cases, different etymologies. *Bethany* may signify, indeed, either place of dates, or place of poverty, etc., a meaning which suits Bethany near Jerusalem; or *place of the ferry-boat* (*Beth-Onijah*), a meaning which would well suit the Bethany which is here in question.[3]

[1] The reading Βηθανια is found in almost all the Mjj.; the large part of the Mnn.; It.; Vg.; Cop.; Syr[sch], etc. Only the Mjj. ℵ T[b] Y Δ Π; some Mnn.; Syr[cur] read, with T. R., Βηθαβαρα.

[2] ℵ, Syr[cur] add ποταμου (*the river*), after Ιορδανου.

[3] Lieutenant Conder, in one of his reports

II. *Second Testimony:* vv. 29–34.

How can we comprehend the fact that the deputies of the Sanhedrim left John without asking him who the person was of whom he intended to speak? Either they did not care to know, or they affected to despise the declaration of the one who spoke to them in this way. In both cases, here is their first positive act of unbelief. After their departure, the forerunner remained with his disciples and the multitude who had been present at this scene; and from the next day his testimony assumed a still more precise character. He no longer merely said, "He is there," but seeing Jesus approaching him, he cries out: "There He is." He characterizes first the *work* (ver. 29), then the *person* of Christ (ver. 30); afterwards, he relates how he attained the knowledge of Him, and on what foundation the *testimony* which He gives to Him rests (vv. 31–33); finally, he sets forth the importance which the act that he has just performed in disburdening himself of such a message in their presence has for his hearers (ver. 34).

Ver. 29. "*The next day he*[1] *sees Jesus coming to him, and he says: Behold the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world.*" The very next day after the day when John had proclaimed the presence of the Messiah in the midst of the people, Jesus approaches His forerunner, who recognizes Him and declares Him to be the Messiah. The words, *coming to Him*, have troubled the interpreters. Some have understood that He came to be baptized, which is impossible, since the following verses (31–33), and even ver. 26, imply that the baptism was already accomplished. *Baur* thinks that Jesus came to John for the purpose of receiving his testimony, and he, of course, finds in this fact, thus understood, a proof of the purely ideal character of the narrative. But this detail implies simply that Jesus, after having been baptized, had, previously to this meeting, separated Himself from John for a certain time, and that after this interval He, on this very day, returned to the presence of His forerunner, hoping to find in His presence those whom God should give to Him in order to begin His work. And we know, in fact, from the Synoptical account, that Jesus, after His baptism, had withdrawn into the solitude of the desert, where He had passed several weeks; it was now the moment, therefore, when He reappeared to take up His work as Redeemer. Nothing is more natural than that, with this design, He should return to the presence of John. Was not he the one who had been sent to open the way for Him to Israel? Was it not at his hands that He could hope to receive the instruments which were indispensable to Him for the accomplishment of

on the discoveries of the English expedition in Palestine, thinks he has proved the existence, on the east of the Jordan, of a district named *Bethany*, which already bore this name in the time of Eusebius, and which, according to Ptolemy, extended even to the Jordan.

[1] The words ὁ Ἰωαννης of the T. R., which are omitted in a large number of Mjj. and Mnn., both Alexandrian and Byzantine, and in several Vss. are one of those additions, especially frequent in the Byzantine text, which were introduced by the necessities of reading in public worship.

His task? Jesus Himself (x. 3) designates John as *the porter* who opens to the Shepherd the door of the sheepfold, so that He does not have to climb over the wall of the inclosure like the robber, but can enter without violence into the sheepfold. *Lücke* also places this return of Jesus in connection with the narrative of the temptation.

We may be surprised that for the purpose of designating Jesus as the Messiah John does not employ one of the titles which were commonly used for this end: Christ, Son of God, or King of Israel. The term *Lamb of God* is so original that, if it is historical, it must have its ground in some particular impression which the Baptist had received at the time of his previous meeting with Jesus. And indeed, we must remember that when an Israelite came to have himself baptized by John, he began by making confession of his sins (Matt. iii. 6; Mk. i. 5). Jesus could not have dispensed with this preparatory act without arrogating to Himself from the first an exceptional position, and nothing was farther from His thought than this: He wished to "fulfill all righteousness" (Matt. iii. 15). What, then, could His confession be? Undoubtedly a collective confession, analogous to that of Daniel (Dan. ix.), or that of Nehemiah (Neh. ix.), a representation of the sin of Israel and of the world, as it could be traced by the pure being who was in communion with the perfectly holy God, and at the same time the tenderly loving being, who, instead of judging His brethren, consecrated Himself to the work of saving them. If, as we cannot doubt, this was the spirit in which Jesus spoke and perhaps prayed at that moment, we may understand that the expression which the forerunner uses here to designate Him, is indeed the reflection of what he had experienced when hearing and seeing this unique man, who, by His tender sympathy and His intercession, took upon Himself the burden of the sin of the world. On the other hand, in order that the title of which the Baptist made use might be intelligible for his hearers, it was indispensable that it should connect itself with some well-known word or some well-known fact of the Old Covenant, which was generally referred to the Messiah. This is implied by the article *ὁ, the*, before the term *Lamb of God*, an article which signifies the Lamb known and expected by the hearers. The thought which presents itself most naturally to the mind is that of seeing here an allusion to the *Servant of the Lord* described in Is. liii., under the figure of a lamb which allows itself "to be led to the slaughter without opening its mouth." On the preceding day, the Baptist had already appealed to a saying of the same prophet (Is. xl. 3). Before the polemic against the Christians had driven the Jewish interpreters to another explanation, they did not hesitate to apply that sublime representation (Is. lii. 13–liii. 12) to the Messiah. *Abarbanel* says expressly: "Jonathan, the son of Usiel, referred this prophecy to the Messiah who was to come, and this is also the opinion of our sages of blessed memory." (See Eisenmenger, *Entdeckt, Judenth*, II. Th. p. 758; *Lücke*, I. p. 406).[1]

[1] Comp. Wünsche, *die Leiden des Messias*, 1870, p. 55 ff. By a multitude of Rabbinical sayings, he furnishes proof that the passages Is. lii. 13–liii. 12, Zech. ix. 9 (*lowly, riding upon an ass*), and xii 10 ("*on me whom they pierced*"), were always and unanimously re-

We need not here prove the truth of this explanation of Is. liii. and the insoluble difficulties in which every contrary interpretation is involved. The fact is sufficient for us that it was the prevalent one among the ancient Jews. From this it follows that the allusion of John the Baptist could be easily understood by the people who were present. Some interpreters have claimed that the term, *Lamb*, represents, in the mouth of the forerunner as well as in the book of Isaiah, only the meekness and patience of the just one suffering for the cause of God. Thus *Gabler:* "Here is the man full of meekness who will support patiently the evils which human perversity shall occasion him;" and *Kuinoel:* "Here is the innocent and pious being who will take away wickedness from the earth." But these explanations do not account for the article *ὁ, the well-known, expected, Lamb*, and they entirely efface the manifest relation which the text establishes between the figure of *lamb* and the act of taking away sin. *Weiss* explains, almost as the preceding writers do, by emphasizing the allusion to Is. liii. 7, but without finding here the least notion of sacrifice. This last view seems to us not defensible. The idea of sacrifice is at the foundation of the whole passage Is. liii.; comp. especially, vv. 10–12: "When his soul shall have offered the expiatory sacrifice *ascham*)," and: "He shall bear their iniquities," words to which precisely John the Baptist alludes in these last words: "*who takes away the sin of the world.*" The Lamb of God designates Jesus, therefore, as realizing the type of the Servant of Jehovah, Is. liii., charged with delivering the world from sin by His sacrifice. Some interpreters, especially *Grotius, Lampe, Luthardt* and *Hofmann*, believe that the Baptist is thinking only of the sacrifices of the Old Covenant in which the lamb was used as a victim, specially of that of the Paschal lamb. It is, indeed, indisputable that, among the clean animals used as victims, the lamb was the one which, by its character of innocence and mildness, presented the emblem most suited to the character of the Messiah as John the Baptist here describes Him (comp. Lev. iv. 32; v. 6; xiv. 12; Num. vi. 12), and that, in particular, the sacrifice of the Paschal lamb really possessed an expiatory value (comp. Ex. xii. 13). It appears to me indubitable, therefore, notwithstanding all that *Weiss* and *Keil* still say, that, in expressing himself as he does here, the forerunner is thinking of the part of the lamb, not in the daily Jewish worship, but in the Paschal feast. And this allusion seems to me to be perfectly reconcilable with the reference to that saying of Is. liii. since in this chapter Isaiah represents the Servant of the Lord precisely under the

ferred to the Messiah and His expiatory sufferings. The very attempt to distinguish between two Messianic personages, the one *the son of Joseph*, or of Ephraim who had the lot of suffering, and the other *the son of Judah*, to whom is ascribed the glory, is only a later endeavor (from the second century, comp. Wünsche, p. 109) to reconcile this undisputed interpretation with the idea of the glorious Messiah. In the book, *The assumption of Moses*, written probably at the time of Jesus' childhood, the author also represents the Messiah as passing through death with all mankind during the space of eight days, and then returning to life with the elect and founding His Kingdom. The idea of the death of the Messiah was, therefore, by no means strange to the popular Israelitish opinion at the time when John the Baptist spoke.

figure of the lamb sacrificed as an expiatory and delivering victim. The complement *θεοῦ, of God,* is the genitive of possession, and at the same time of origin. In this sacrifice, indeed, it is not man who offers and slays, it is God who gives, and gives of His own. Comp. 1 Pet. i. 19, 20; Rom. viii. 32. It is remarkable that this title of *lamb,* under which the evangelist learned to know Jesus for the first time, is that by means of which the Saviour is by preference designated in the Apocalypse. The chord which had vibrated, at this decisive hour, in the deepest part of John's heart resounded within him even to his latest breath.

Exegetes are not agreed as to the sense which the word *αἴρων, who takes away,* has here. The verb *αἴρειν* sometimes signifies to *raise a thing* from the ground, to lift it, sometimes *to take it away,* to carry it away. For the first sense, comp. viii. 29 (stones); Matt. xi. 29 (the yoke): xvi. 24 (the cross). For the second: John xi. 39, 48, xv. 2, xvii. 15, etc., and especially 1 John iii. 5: "Jesus Christ appeared to take away our sins." The second sense would lead rather to the idea of the destruction of sin; the first, to that of expiation, as in some expressions of the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah. But if John had thought especially of expiation, he would probably have employed the term *βαστάζειν,* to bear, which the LXX. used in the words quoted from Is. liii. He is probably, therefore, thinking of the taking away of sin. Let us not forget, however, that, in accordance with Is. liii. and the Israelitish worship in general, this end cannot be attained except by means of expiation. In order to take away sin, it was necessary that Christ should begin by taking upon Himself the burden of it, to the end that he might be able afterwards to remove it by the work of sanctification. The idea of removing includes, therefore, implicitly that of bearing. The present participle *αἴρων* might be referred to the *idea* of the mission of Jesus. But it is more simple to see in it an historical present; since the first act of His ministry, Jesus has labored for the taking away of sin on earth.

The burden to be taken away is designated in a grand and sublime way: *the sin of the world.* This substantive in the singular presents the sinful error of humanity in its profound unity. It is sin *in the mass,* in which all the sins of all the sinners of the world are comprehended. Do they not all spring from the same root? We must guard against understanding by *ἁμαρτία,* as *de Wette* does, *the penalty* of sin. This idea, "the sin of *the world,*" has been judged too universal for the Baptist's mouth. So *Weiss* ascribes it solely to the evangelist. *Reuss* says: "We have here an essentially Christian declaration." But in Is. lii. 13–15, it was already said that the sight of the suffering Servant would startle *many peoples* (*rabbim*) and would strike their kings with astonishment. And who, then, were these *many* individuals (*rabbim*) whom, according to liii. 11, this same Servant was to *justify,* after Israel had rejected Him (ver. 1)? Comp. also the wonderful prophecy, Is. xix. 24, 25, where the Assyrians, the Egyptians and Israel are represented as forming the three parts, perfectly equal in dignity, of the kingdom of God. Could Isaiah have surpassed in clearness of vision the Baptist, who was not only a prophet, but the greatest of the prophets?

This expression *the world* says no more, in reality, than that threatening or promise which the Synoptics put into the mouth of the forerunner: "Even of these stones God will raise up children to Abraham." Let us also recall that first word of the Lord to Abraham (Gen. xii. 3): "All the families of the earth shall be blessed (or shall bless themselves) in thee."

The forerunner, after having described the work of Jesus, designates Him Himself as the one to whom, notwithstanding His humble appearance, his declaration of the day before applies:

Ver. 30. "*This is he*[1] *concerning whom I said: After me cometh a man who has preceded me, because he was before me.*" This saying, while applying to Jesus as *present* (*this is he*) the testimony uttered on the preceding day in His absence (vv. 26, 27), is designed to solve the enigma which that declaration contained: "He who *follows* me was *before* me." The last clause explains it; see on ver. 15. It is difficult to decide between the two readings περί, *in respect to*, and ὑπέρ, *on behalf of*, both of which are suitable. The word ἀνήρ (a *man* in the strength of his age) which is not found in the quotation of this saying in ver. 15, is suggested to the forerunner by the sight of Jesus present before his eyes. *Lücke, Meyer, Keil* think that in ver. 30 the Baptist refers, not to the testimony of the day before (vv. 26, 27), but to some other previous saying which is not mentioned, either in our Gospel or in the Synoptics. They are condemned to this absurd supposition by their servile dependence on the Alexandrian text, which in ver. 27 omitted the words: *who has preceded me*. *Weiss* attempts to escape this difficulty by making the formula of quotation: *he of whom I said*, ver. 30, relate simply to the words: *cometh after me*, and not to those which follow, *who has preceded me*, an unfortunate expedient which cannot satisfy any one. For the emphasis, as the end of the verse shows, is precisely on the words which *Weiss* thus treats as insignificant. The systematic partisans of the Alexandrian text must, therefore, bring themselves to acknowledge, in this case also, that that text is no more infallible than the Byzantine or the Greco-Latin.

But how can John the Baptist have the boldness to give such a testimony to this mere Jew, like all the rest whom he had before him there, and to proclaim Him as the Redeemer of men, the being whom God had drawn forth from the depth of eternal existence that He might give Him to the world? He explains this himself in vv. 31–33:

Ver. 31. "*And neither did I know him; but that he might be manifested to Israel, I am come baptizing with water.*[2] The word κἀγώ, *and neither I*, placed at the beginning and repeated, as it is in ver. 33, has necessarily an especial emphasis. The meaning is obvious: he has just said to his hearers: "*He whom you know not.*" When, therefore, he adds: "And neither did I know him," it is clear that he means: "And neither did I, when he came to present himself to me to be baptized, know him any more than you now know him." *Weiss* and *Keil* object to this meaning, that it can-

[1] Instead of περι (*touching*), ℵ B C and Orig. (twice) read ὑπέρ (*on behalf of*).

[2] B C G L P T^{b} Δ Or. reject τῳ before ὕδατι.

not be applied to the two κἀγώ of vv. 33, 34. We shall see that this is not correct. According to these interpreters the "*and I*" signifies: "*I*, for my part, that is, according to my mere human individuality, and independently of the divine revelation." But it is this meaning which is inapplicable to ver. 34; and besides, it is very far-fetched. John means: I did not know him absolutely when he came to present himself to me; I did not know, therefore, that He was the Messiah. But we must not neglect to draw from this only natural meaning the important consequence which is implied in it: that John also did not know Jesus *as a man*, as the Son of Mary; for, if he had known Him as such, it would have been impossible for him not to know Him also as the Messiah. He could not be ignorant of the circumstances which had accompanied his own birth and that of Jesus. If, therefore, he did not know Jesus as Messiah, no more did he know Him personally. And this can be understood: having lived *in the wilderness* up to the time of his manifestation to Israel (Luke i. 80), he might indeed have heard the marvelous circumstances of his own birth and of the birth of the Son of Mary related by his parents, but without having ever seen Him. It *must necessarily*, even, have been so, in order to his not recognizing Jesus *as the Messiah*, when He presented Himself to Him for baptism. And it is only in this way that the testimony given by him to Jesus is raised above all suspicion of bias. This is the reason why John brings out this circumstance with so much stress by the three successive κἀγώ. Here is the guarantee of the truth of his testimony. But, in this case, how can we explain the word which John addresses to Jesus in the narrative of Matthew (iii. 14): "I have need to be baptized of thee." To resolve this difficulty, it is not necessary to resort to the expedient, which was found already in the Gospel of the Hebrews and which Lücke has renewed,—that of placing this conversation between John and Jesus *after* the baptism of the latter. We have already recalled the fact that, according to Matt. iii. 6 and Mk. i. 5, the baptism of John was preceded, on the part of the neophyte, by an act of confession of sins. The confession which the forerunner heard proceeding from the mouth of Jesus might easily convince him that he had to do with a more holy being than himself, who had a deep sense of sin and condemned it, as he had never felt and condemned it himself, and could thus extort from him the exclamation which Matthew relates. Not knowing Jesus personally, John received Him as he did every other Israelite; after having heard Him speak of the sin of the world, he caught sight of the first gleam of the truth; finally, the scene which followed completed his conviction.

The logical connection between this clause and the following one is this: "And that I might bring to an end that ignorance in which I still was, even as you are now, is the very reason why God has sent me to baptize." The Baptist's ministry had undoubtedly a more general aim: to prepare the people for the Kingdom of God by repentance, or, as he has said himself in ver. 22: "to make straight the way of the Lord." But he makes prominent here only that which forms the culminating point of his ministry, the testimony borne to the person of the Messiah, without which all

his labor would have been useless. The article τῷ before ὕδατι (*the water*) appears to me to have been wrongly rejected by the Alexandrian authorities; there is something dramatic in it: "I am come to baptize with *that water*" (pointing to the Jordan). Without the article, there would be a tacit contrast between the *baptism of water* and another (that of the Spirit), which is not in the thought of the context. John now explains how that ignorance ceased for him on the occasion of the baptism which he began to solemnize by the command of God.

Ver. 32. "*And John bore witness saying: I have seen the Spirit descending as*[1] *a dove, and it abode*[2] *upon Him.*" This declaration is introduced with a peculiar solemnity by the words: "*And John bore witness.*" Here, indeed, is the decisive act, as *Hengstenberg* calls it, the *punctum saliens* of the entire ministry of John the Baptist, his Messianic testimony properly so called. With what sense had John *seen?* With the bodily eye, or with the inner sense? This is to ask whether the fact mentioned here took place only in the spiritual world, or also in the external world. According to the narratives of Mark (i. 10, 11), and of Matthew (iii. 16, 17), it was the object of the perception of Jesus only. "And behold, the heavens were opened, and *he saw* the Spirit . . . " (Matt.): "And straightway coming out of the water *he saw* . . . " (Mark). In Luke the narrative is completely objective: "*It came to pass that . . . . . the heaven was opened*" (iii. 21, 22). But the narrative in Matthew makes the Baptist also participate in this heavenly manifestation by the form of the declaration of God: "*This is* my Son;" not as in Mark and Luke: "*Thou art* my Son." The divine declaration in Matthew addresses itself, therefore, not to Jesus who is the object, but to him who is the witness of it, namely, John. Now, if it was perceived simultaneously by Jesus and by John, it must have had an objective reality, as the narrative of Luke says. The following is, perhaps, the way in which we can represent to ourselves the relation between the perception of Jesus and that of John: The divine communication, properly so called (the declaration of the Father and the communication of the Spirit), was given from God to Jesus, and the latter had knowledge of the fact at once by the impression which He received, and by a vision which rendered it sensible to him. As to John, he was associated in the perception of this symbolic manifestation, and thereby initiated into the spiritual fact, of which it was as if the covering. Thus the voice which said to Jesus: "*Thou art* my Son," sounded within him in this form: "*This is* my Son." *Neander* cannot admit that a symbolic communication, a vision, could have found a place in the relation between Jesus and God. But this rule is applicable only to the time which followed the baptism. It has been wrongly concluded from the expression, *I have seen*, that, according to the fourth Gospel, the vision was only perceived by John, to the exclusion of Jesus. It is forgotten that the forerunner, in his present account, has no other aim

[1] Instead of ωσει which T. R. reads with 8 Mjj., ℵ A B C and 8 Mjj. read ως.

[2] ℵ reads μενον instead of εμεινεν.

but to justify his testimony. For this purpose he does not have to speak of anything else than that which he has himself seen. This is the reason why he relates the fact of the baptism only from the point of view of his own perception.

In the fact here described, we must distinguish the real gift made to Jesus, which is indicated by the narrative in these words: *the Spirit descending and abiding* upon Him; and the symbolic representation of this gift intended for the consciousness of Christ and for that of John: the visible form of the dove. The *heaven* as we behold it with the bodily eye, is the emblem of the state perfect in holiness, in knowledge, in power, in felicity. It is, consequently, in the Scriptures the symbol of the place where God manifests His perfections, in all their splendor, where His glory shines forth perfectly, and from which the supernatural revelations and forces proceed. John sees descending from the sky, which is rent, a luminous form like a *dove*, which rests and abides upon Jesus. This symbol is nowhere employed in the Old Testament to represent the Holy Spirit. In the Syrian religions, the dove was the image of the force of nature which broods over all beings. But this analogy is too remote for the explanation of our passage. The words of Matt. x. 16: "*Be ye harmless as doves*," have no direct relation to the Holy Spirit. We find some passages in the Jewish Rabbis, where the Spirit who *hovered over the waters* (Gen. i. 3) is connected with the Spirit of the Messiah, and compared to a dove, which hovers over its young without touching them (see *Lücke*, p. 426). Perhaps this comparison, familiar to the Jewish mind, is that which explains for us, most naturally, the present form of the divine revelation. This emblem was admirably adapted to the decisive moment of the baptism of Jesus. It was a matter, indeed, of nothing less than the new creation, which was to be the consummation of the first creation. Humanity passed at that instant from the sphere of the natural or psychical life to that of the spiritual life, with a view to which it had been created at the first, 1 Cor. xv. 46. The creative Spirit which had of old brooded with His life-giving power over chaos, to draw from it a world full of order and harmony, was going, as if by a new incubation, to transform the first humanity into a heavenly humanity. But that which must here be observed is the *organic* form which the luminous apparition assumes. An organism is an indivisible whole. At Pentecost, the Spirit descends in the form of "*cloven tongues* (διαμεριζόμεναι γλῶσσαι)" which distribute themselves among the believers. This is the true symbol of the way in which the Holy Spirit dwells in the Church, *distributing to each one His gifts according as He pleases* (1 Cor. xii. 11). But at the baptism of Jesus, the fact is another and the emblem is different. The Spirit descends upon Christ in His fullness. "*God*," it is said in iii. 34, "*gives not to Him the Spirit by measure.*" Comp. Is. xi. 1, 2, where the seven forms of the Spirit, enumerated in order to designate His fullness, come to rest upon the Messiah. We must notice, finally, the term *to abide*, which is a precise allusion to the word נוח in this passage of Isaiah (xi. 2). The prophets received occasional inspirations: *the hand of the Lord was upon*

them; then, withdrawing Himself, the Spirit left them to themselves. It was thus, also, with John the Baptist. But Jesus will not only be visited by the Spirit; the Spirit will dwell in Him, and will even one day be poured forth from Him, as if from His source, upon believers; this is the reason why in ver. 33 the idea of *abiding* is placed in close connection with that of *baptizing with the Holy Spirit.* The reading ὡσεί emphasizes more strongly even than the simple ὡς the purely symbolic character of the luminous appearance. The μένον of the Sinaitic MS. is a correction arising from the καταβαῖνον which precedes. The proposition is broken off designedly (καὶ ἐμεινεν), in order to make more fully apparent the idea of *abiding,* by isolating it from what precedes. The construction of the accusative ἐπ' αὐτόν, *upon Him,* with the verb of rest *to abide,* springs from the living character of the relation, (comp. ver. 1 and 18). But had John the Baptist properly interpreted the vision? Had he not ascribed to it a meaning which it did not have? This last possible doubt is answered by the fact related in the following verse.

Ver. 33. "*And neither did I know him; but he who sent me to baptize with water, he said to me: The man on whom thou shalt see the Spirit descend and abide, is he who baptizeth with the Holy Spirit.*" Not only was a sign given (ver. 32); but this sign was that which had been promised, and the meaning of which had been indicated beforehand. No human arbitrariness can, therefore, mingle itself with this testimony which John renders to Jesus. Κἀγώ: And I repeat it to you: When He presented Himself, I did not know Him any more than you now know Him. I have then placed here nothing of my own. The expression ὁ πέμψας, *He who sent me,* has something solemn and mysterious in it; John evidently means to designate thereby God Himself who had spoken to him in the desert and given him his commission. This commission included: 1. The command to baptize; 2. The promise to reveal to him the Messiah on the occasion of the baptism; 3. The indication of the sign by which He should be manifested to him; 4. The command to bear testimony to Him in Israel. The emphatic resumption of the subject by the pronoun ἐκεῖνος, *he,* with its meaning which is so emphatic in John, makes prominent this idea: That everything in this testimony proceeds from Jehovah, and Jehovah only. *Weiss,* who is not willing to acknowledge the special and commonly exclusive sense which this pronoun has in the fourth Gospel, thinks that it serves here to place God, as the more remote subject, in contrast with Jesus, as the nearest object. But to what purpose mark a contrast between Jesus and God? The pronoun indisputably signifies: "He and not another." The sign had been announced by God Himself. The words ἐφ' ὃν ἂν (*on whom*), indicate the most unlimited contingency: Whoever he may be, though he be the poorest of the Israelites. The act of *baptizing with the Holy Spirit* is indicated here as the peculiar work of the Messiah. By the baptism of water, John gives to the repentant sinner the pledge of pardon and the promise of sanctification; by the gift of the Holy Spirit, the Messiah realizes this last promise, and accomplishes thereby the highest destiny of the human soul.

The Gift made to Jesus in the Baptism.

Vv. 32, 33, suggest an important question: Did Jesus really *receive* anything at His baptism? *Meyer* denies this, alleging that this idea has no support in our Gospel, and that, if the Synoptics say more, it is because they contain a tradition which had been already altered. The real fact was solely the vision granted *to John* in view of the testimony which he was to render to Jesus. This vision was transformed by tradition into the event related by the Synoptics. The idea of the real communication of the Holy Spirit to Jesus would be incompatible with that of the incarnation of the Logos. *Lücke* and *de Wette* think, also, that Jesus received nothing new at that moment. John was only instructed, by means of the vision, as to a permanent fact in the life of Jesus, His communion with the Holy Spirit. *Neander*, *Tholuck* and *Ebrard* think that there was simply progress in the *consciousness* which Jesus had of Himself. *Baumgarten-Crusius*, *Kahnis*, *Luthardt*, *Gess*, allow a real communication, but only with reference to the *task* which Jesus had to fulfill, that of His own ministry, and of the communication of the Holy Spirit to other men. The opinion of *Meyer*, as well as that of *Lücke*, sacrifices the narrative of the Synoptics, and even that of John to a dogmatic prejudice; for John saw the Spirit not only *abiding*, but *descending*, and this last feature must correspond to a reality, as well as the other. The view of *Neander* is true, but inadequate. There was certainly wrought, at that moment, a decided advance in the consciousness of Jesus, as is indicated by the fact of the divine address: *Thou art my Son;* but the symbol of the *descent* of the dove must also correspond to a real fact. Finally, the view which admits an actual gift, but only in relation to the public activity of Jesus, appears to me superficial. In a life so completely *one* as that of Jesus, where there is nothing purely ritual, where the external is always the manifestation of the internal, the beginning of a new activity supposes a change in His own personal life.

When we lay hold of the idea of the incarnation with the force with which it is apprehended and presented by Paul and John (see ver. 14, and the Appendix to the Prologue), when we recognize the fact that the Logos divested Himself of the divine state, and that He entered into a really human state, in order to accomplish the normal development originally assigned to every man, there is nothing further to prevent us from holding that, after having accomplished the task of the first Adam on the pathway of free obedience, He should have seen opening before Him the sphere of the higher life for which man is destined, and that, as the first among the violent who take the kingdom of heaven by force, He should have forced the entrance into it for Himself and for all. Undoubtedly, His entire existence had passed on under the constant influence of the Holy Spirit which had presided over his birth. At every moment, He had obeyed this divine guide, and each time this docility had been immediately rewarded by a new impulse. The vessel was filled in proportion as it enlarged, and it enlarged in proportion as it was filled. But to be under the operation of the Spirit is not to possess the Spirit (xiv. 17). With the hour of the baptism, the moment came when the previous development was to be transformed into the definite state, that of *the perfect stature* (Eph. iv. 13). "First, that which is psychical," says Paul, in 1 Cor. xv. 46, "afterwards that which is spiritual." If the incarnation is a verity, this law must apply to the development of Jesus, as much as to that of every other man. Till then, the Spirit was *upon* Him ἐπ' αὐτό [τὸ παιδίον] Luke ii. 40; He increased, under

this divine influence, in wisdom and grace. From the time of the baptism, the Spirit becomes the principle of His psychical and physical activity, of His whole personal life; He can begin to be called *Lord-Spirit* (2 Cor. iii. 17, 18); *life-giving Spirit* (1 Cor. xv. 45).

The baptism, therefore, constitutes in His interior life as decisive a crisis as does the ascension in His external state. The *open heaven* represents His initiation into the consciousness of God and of His designs. The voice: *Thou art my Son*, indicates the revelation to His inmost consciousness of His personal relation with God, of His eternal dignity as Son, and, at the same time, of the boundlessness of divine love towards Him, and towards humanity on which such a gift is bestowed. He fully apprehends the name of Father as applied to God, and can proclaim it to the world. The Holy Spirit becomes His personal life, makes Him the principle and source of life for all men. Nevertheless, His glorification is not yet; the natural life, whether psychical or physical, still exists in Him, as such. It is after the ascension only that His soul and body will be completely spiritualized (*σῶμα πνευματικόν*, 1 Cor. xv. 44).

But, it is asked, does not the gift of the Holy Spirit form a needless repetition of the miraculous birth? By no means; for in this latter event the Holy Spirit acts only as a life-giving force in the stead and place of the paternal principle. He wakens into the activity of life the germ of a human existence deposited in the womb of Mary, the organ prepared for the Logos that He may realize there a human development; in the same way as, on the day of creation, the soul of the first man, breath of the creating God, came to dwell in the bodily organ prepared for its abode and for its earthly activity (Gen. ii. 7).

Some modern theologians, in imitation of some of the Fathers, think that the Logos is confounded by John with the Spirit. But undoubtedly every one will acknowledge the truth of this remark of Lücke: "No more could we say, on the one hand, 'The Spirit was made flesh,' than we could say, on the other, 'I have seen the Logos descend upon Jesus.'" The distinction between the Logos and the Spirit, scrupulously observed by John, even in chaps. xiv.-xvi., where *Reuss* thinks it is sometimes wholly effaced (*Hist. de la th. chrét.* ii., p. 533 f.), is the following: The Logos is the principle of *objective* revelation, and, through his incarnation, the culminating point of that revelation, while the Spirit is the principle acting internally by which we assimilate to ourselves that revelation subjectively. Hence it results that, without the Spirit, the revelation remains for us a dead letter, and Jesus a simple historical personage with whom we do not enter into any communion. It is by the Spirit alone that we appropriate to ourselves the revelation contained in the word and person of Jesus. Thus, from the time when the Spirit begins to do His work in us, it is Jesus Himself who begins to live within us. As, through the Spirit, Jesus lived on earth by the Father, so, through the Spirit, the believer lives by Jesus (vi. 57). This distinction of offices between Christ and the Spirit is steadily maintained throughout our whole Gospel.[1]

This solemn testimony being given, the forerunner expresses the feeling of satisfaction with which this grand task accomplished inspires him, yet

[1] Hilgenfeld, identifying the descent of the Holy Spirit at the baptism with the coming of the Æon Logos into the man Jesus (according to the Valentinians), finds here a trace of Gnosticism. This idea has not the least support in the text.

so as, at the same time, to make his hearers understand that their own task is beginning.

Ver. 34. "*And I have seen and have borne witness that this is the Son of God.*"[1] The ἐγώ, *I*, in κἀγώ, distinguishes, as in vv. 31, 33, him who alone was to *see*, and who *also* (καί) has seen, from all the others who were to *believe* on the ground of his testimony. The perfects: *I have seen* and *I have testified* indicate facts accomplished once for all and abiding for the future. The ὅτι, *that*, depends on the second verb only; the verb *to see* is without an object; it is the act which is of importance, as the condition of that of testifying. The term *Son of God* characterizes a being as a representative of the divinity in a particular function. It is applied in the Old Testament to angels, to judges, to kings, and, finally, to the Messiah: "*Thou art my Son; to-day have I begotten thee*" (Ps. ii. 7, 12); but there is a difference in the mode of representation in each case. An ambassador represents his sovereign, but otherwise than does the son of the latter, for the son, while representing the sovereign, represents in him also his father. Ver. 30 proves that John the Baptist takes the word *Son* here in the loftiest sense which can be attached to it; the being whose existence is united to that of God by an incomparable bond, and who comes to fulfill here on earth the function of Saviour.

III.—*Third Testimony:* vv. 35–37.

Vv. 35, 36. "*On the next day, John was again standing there, and two of his disciples with him;* 36, *and fixing his eyes upon Jesus as he passed he saith: Behold the Lamb of God.*" Holy impressions, great thoughts, an unutterable expectation doubtless filled, even on the following day, the hearts of those who had heard the words of the forerunner. The next day, John is at his post ready to continue his ministry as the Baptist. We are not at all authorized to suppose, with *de Wette*, that the two disciples who were with him had not been present at the scene of the preceding day. Far from favoring this idea, the brevity of the present testimony leads us rather to suppose that John confines himself to recalling that of the day before to persons who had heard it. The expression ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν, *of his disciples*, intimates that he had a very considerable number of them. Of these two disciples, one was Andrew (ver. 40); it is difficult to suppose that the other was not the author of the narrative which is to follow. All the subsequent details have no special importance except for the one to whom they recalled the most decisive and happiest hour of his life. The fact that his person remains anonymous, while the four others who play a part in the narrative are all named, confirms this conclusion (*Introd.* p. 203). We may notice a certain difference between this day and the day before in the relation of Jesus to John. The day before, Jesus came *to John*, as to the one who was to introduce Him

[1] Instead of ο υιος του θεου, ℵ reads ο εκλεκτος του θεου. It is the only document which presents this plainly indefensible reading.

to future believers. On this day, the testimony is officially given; He has only in a sense to receive *from the hands of* His forerunner the souls which His Father has prepared through him. Like the magnet which one moves through the sand to attract metallic particles, He simply approaches the group which surrounds the Baptist, for the purpose of deciding some of those who compose it to follow Him. The conduct of Jesus is, therefore, perfectly intelligible. It is regulated according to the natural course of the divine work. The Church is not torn, it is gathered, from the tree of the theocracy. This easiness in the course is the seal of God.

As Jesus enters into the plan of God, John the Baptist enters into the thought of Jesus. A tender and respectful scruple might detain the two disciples near their old master. John the Baptist himself frees them from this bond, and begins to realize that saying, which from this moment becomes his motto: "*He must increase, but I must decrease.*" The word ἐμβλέψας indicates a penetrating look which searches its object to its depths (see ver. 42). The practical meaning of this new declaration of John was evidently this: "Go to Him." Otherwise, to what purpose this repetition which adds nothing to the testimony of the day before, which, on the contrary, abridges it? Only this invitation is expressed in an indirect form, that of an affirmation *respecting* the person of Jesus, because, as *Luthardt* says, attachment to Jesus was to be on their part an act of freedom based upon a personal impression, not a matter of obedience to their old master.

Ver. 37. "*And the two disciples heard him speak*[1] *thus, and they followed Jesus.*" John's word, which was an exclamation, was understood. It is very evident that, in the thought of the evangelist, these words: "*And they followed Jesus,*" conceal, under their literal sense, a richer meaning. This first step in following Jesus decided their whole life; the bond, apparently accidental, which was formed at that hour, was, in reality, an eternal bond.

The Testimonies of the Forerunner.

We have still to examine three questions which criticism has raised in regard to these testimonies.

I. *Baur* and *Keim*[2] maintain that the narrative of the fourth Gospel denies, by its silence, the fact of the Baptism of Jesus by John; and this for the dogmatic reason, that it would have been contrary to the dignity of the Logos to *receive* the Holy Spirit.—*Hilgenfeld* himself rejects this view (*Einl.* pp. 702 and 719): "The baptism of Jesus," he says, "is *supposed*, not related." The second testimony of John vv. 31 f., mentions it as an accomplished fact, and vv. 32, 33 imply it, since their meaning can only be this: "Among the Israelites who shall come to thy baptism, there shall be found one on whom, when thou shalt baptize him, thou shalt see the Spirit descend. . . . " *Holtzmann* has recognized the indisputable bearing of this passage.[3] But if the fact is not *related*, it is simply, because, as we

[1] ℵ and B place αυτου before λαλουντος.

[2] *Keim* (I., p. 520): "The fourth Gospel is wholly ignorant of a baptism of Jesus by John."

[3] Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1872 p. 156 f.

have discovered, the starting point of the narrative is chosen subsequently to the baptism. If the Logos-theory in our Gospel were to play the part which, in this case, Baur and Keim attribute to it, it would exclude from the history of Jesus many other facts which are related at full length by our evangelist.

II. It has been regarded as inconceivable, that, after such a sign and such declarations, the Baptist could have addressed to Jesus, from the depths of his prison, this question: "*Art thou he that should come, or are we to look for another*" (Matt. xi. 3)? *Strauss* has derived from this proceeding of John, a ground for denying the whole scene of the baptism. Some of the Fathers supposed that the forerunner wished thereby only to strengthen the faith of his disciples by calling forth a positive declaration, on Jesus' part, respecting His Messianic character. But the terms of the Synoptical account do not allow this meaning. Two circumstances may be alleged which must have exercised an unfavorable influence upon John's faith; first, his imprisonment (*Meyer*), then the malevolent disposition of his disciples with regard to Jesus (iii. 26), which might have reacted at length on the already depressed spirit of their master. These two circumstances undoubtedly prepared the way for the shaking of faith produced in John; but they cannot suffice to explain it; we must add, with *Bäumlein*, the fact that there was in John, besides the prophet, the natural man who was by no means secure from falling. This is what Jesus gives us to understand when, in His reply, He said, evidently thinking of John: "*Blessed is he who is not offended in me*" (Matt. xi. 6 comp. with ver. 11). *Lücke* has explained this fall by the striking contrast between the expectation, which John had expressed, of a powerful and judicial activity of the Messiah in order to purify the theocracy, and the humble and patient labor of Jesus. A comparison of the reply of the latter to the messengers of John (Matt. xi. 4–6) with the proclamations of John (Matt. iii. 10, 12) is enough to convince us of the justice of this observation. But to all this we must still add a last and more decisive fact. It is this: John did not for an instant doubt concerning the divine mission of Jesus and concerning this mission as higher than his own. This follows, first, from the fact that it is to Jesus Himself that he addresses himself in order to be enlightened, and then, from the very meaning of his question: "Art thou he that should come or are we to look for another (literally, a second)?" We must recall to mind here the prevailing doubt, at that time, in relation to the *prophet*, like to Moses, whose coming was to prepare the way for that of the Messiah (according to Deut. xviii. 18). Some identified him with the Messiah himself; comp. John vi. 14, 15: "It is of a truth the prophet. . . . They were going to take him by force, to *make him king*." Others, on the contrary, distinguished this prophet *par excellence*, from the Messiah properly so-called; comp. vii. 40, 41. They attributed, probably, to the first of these personages the *spiritual* side of the expected transformation, and to the Messiah, as King descended from David, the *political* side of this renovation. John the Baptist had, at first, united these two offices in the single person of Jesus. But learning in his prison that the work of Jesus limited itself to working miracles of healing, to giving forth the preachings of a purely prophetic character, he asks himself whether this anointed one of the Holy Spirit would not have as His part in the Messianic work only the spiritual office, and whether the political restoration and the outward judgment announced by him would not be devolved upon a subsequent messenger; to the divine prophet, the work of pardon and regeneration; to the King of a Davidic race, the acts of power which were des-

tined to realize the external triumph of the Kingdom of God. This is precisely what the form of the question in Matthew expresses: ἕτερον, not ἄλλον: *a second* (Messiah); not: *another* (as Messiah): this expression really ascribes to Jesus the Messianic character, only not exclusively.[1] At the foundation, this distinction which was floating before the eyes of the Baptist had in it nothing erroneous. It answers quite simply to the two offices of Jesus, at His first and second coming. At the first coming, pardon and the Spirit; at the second, judgment and royalty. The Jewish learned men were led by the apparently contradictory prophecies of the Old Testament, to an analogous distinction. *Buxtorf* (*Lexic. Chaldaic.* p. 1273) and *Eisenmenger* (*Entdeckt, Judenth.* pp. 744 f.) cite a mass of rabbinical passages which distinguish two Messiahs,—the one, whom they call *the son of Joseph*, or of Ephraim, to whom they ascribe the humiliations foretold respecting the Messiah; the other, whom they name *the son of David*, to whom they apply the prophecies of glory. The first will make war, and will perish; for him the sufferings; the second will raise the first to life again and will live eternally. "Those who shall escape from the sword of the first, will fall under that of the second." "The one shall not bear envy against the other, *juxta fidem nostram*," says Jarchi (*ad. Jes.* xi. 13). These last words attest the high antiquity of this idea.

III. *Renan* (*Vie de Jésus*, pp. 108 f.) draws a poetic picture of the relation between "these two young enthusiasts, full of the same hopes and the same hates, who were able to make common cause and mutually to support each other." He describes Jesus arriving from Galilee with "a little school already formed," and John fully welcoming "this swarm of young Galileans," even though they do not attach themselves to him but form a separate band around Jesus. "We have not many examples, it is true," observes Renan, "of the head of a school eagerly welcoming the one who is to succeed him;" but is not youth capable of all self-abnegations? Behold the romance: the history shows us Jesus arriving alone and receiving from John himself these young Galileans who are for the future to accompany Him. We can understand how there is in this story a troublesome fact for those who are unwilling to explain the history except by natural causes.

The manner in which John the Baptist, at the height of his ascendant and his glory, throws himself immediately and voluntarily into the shade that he may leave the field free for one younger than himself, who until then was completely obscure, cannot be explained by the natural generosity of youth. Conscious, as he was, of the divinity of his mission, John could not thus retire into the shade except before a divine demonstration of the higher mission of Jesus. The conduct of John the Baptist, as attested by our four evangelists, remains for the historian, who does not recognize here the work of God, an insoluble problem. Before closing, one word more on a fancy of *Keim*. This scholar alleges (I., p

[1] The expectation of a great prophet, who is not expressly designated as Messiah, may be proved from the work entitled *The Assumption of Moses*, composed in the years which followed the death of Herod the Great (comp. Wieseler, *Stud. u. Kritiken*, 1868, and Schürer, *Lehrbuch*, etc., p. 540). In this work, which contains the most faithful description of the spiritual state of the Jewish people at the very time of the birth of Jesus, there is announced (chap. 14, Latin transl. published by Ceriani), the coming of a *supreme messenger*, *nuntius in summo constitutus*, whose *hands shall be filled*, in order to effect the deliverance of the people. Moses himself receives only the name of *great messenger*, *magnus nuntius* (c. 18). This messenger will, therefore, be the final prophet, a Moses of the second power; but no royal and Messianic title is ascribed to him.

525) that, in opposition to the Synoptical account (comp. especially Luke iii. 21), our Gospel makes Jesus *the first* of all the people to come to the baptism of John.[1] Where do we find in John's narrative a word which justifies this assertion? But: *sic volo, sic jubeo!*

IV. We are now able to embrace the Messianic testimony of the Baptist in its totality. First, the calling of the people to repentance and baptism, with the vague announcement of the nearness of the Messiah. He comes! (See the Synoptics.) Then, the three days which form the beginning of the narrative of John: He is present! Behold Him! Follow Him! Finally, the last summons: Woe unto you, if you refuse to follow Him! (iii. 28–36.) This totality is so much the more remarkable as the particular elements of it are scattered in several writings and different narratives.

SECOND SECTION.

I. 38–52.

Beginnings of the Work of Jesus.—Birth of Faith.

Testimony is the condition of faith. For faith is, at the outset, the acceptance of a divine fact on the foundation of testimony. But there is here only an external relation between the believer and the object of faith. In order to become living, faith must enter into direct contact with its object. In the case which occupies our thought, this contact demanded personal manifestations of Jesus, fitted to change believers into witnesses, and to form a direct connection between their hearts and Jesus. This is precisely what the following narratives describe to us. They are divided into two groups; the first comprising that which relates to the three earliest disciples, Andrew, John and Peter (vv. 38–43); the second, that which concerns Philip and Nathanael (vv. 44–52).

I.—*First Group:* vv. 38–43.

We have just mentioned John. Almost all the adversaries of the authenticity themselves acknowledge that the author, in relating his story as he does here, wishes to pass himself off as one of the apostles. Even *Hilgenfeld* says: "Andrew and an unnamed person who is assuredly John."

Vv. 38, 39. "*Then*[2] *Jesus turned and saw them following and saith unto them, What seek ye?* 39. *They said unto Him: Rabbi* (*which is to say, Master*) *where dwellest thou?*" Jesus, hearing footsteps behind Him, turns about. He sees these two young men who are following Him with the desire to accost Him, but who do not venture to begin the conversation by addressing Him. He anticipates them: "*What seek ye?*" He who thus interrogates them knows full well what they are seeking after. He knows to whom the desire of Israel and the sighing of humanity tend; He is not ignorant that He is Himself their object. By their answer, the disci-

[1] "Das vierte Evangelium kehrt die Dinge um und lässt Jesum zuerst auf der Stelle sein."

[2] Mjj. and 30 Mnn. omit δε.

ples modestly express the desire to speak with Him in private. The title *Rabbi* is undoubtedly quite inferior to that which the testimony of John had revealed to them concerning Jesus. But discretion prevents them for the moment from saying more. This title, at the same time, expresses indirectly the intention to offer themselves to Him as disciples. The translation of this term, which is added by the evangelist, proves that the author is writing for Greek readers.[1]

Ver. 40. "*He saith unto them: Come, and you shall see.*[2] *They came*[3] *and saw where he abode: and they remained with him that day; it was*[4] *about the tenth hour.*" The disciples made inquiries as to His dwelling, that they might afterwards visit Him there. Jesus invites them to follow Him at once: "Come *immediately.*" This is, indeed, what the present ἔρχεσθε indicates: the continuance of the going. It has been said that this sense would require the aorist. This is an error. The aorist would signify: *set about* going. Is the reading of the *Vatican* MS.: "Come and *you shall see*," preferable to that of the greater part of the other documents? We may suppose that the latter comes from ver. 47. Where was Jesus dwelling? Was it in a caravansary, or in a friend's house? We do not know. No more do we know what was the subject of their conversation. But we do know the result of it. Andrew's exclamation in ver. 42 is the enthusiastic expression of the effect produced on the two disciples. When we remember what the Messiah was to the thought of a Jew, we understand how powerful and profound must have been the impression produced upon them by Jesus, to the end that they should not hesitate to proclaim as Messiah this poor and unostentatious man. In the remark: "*And they remained with Him that day*," all the sweetness of a recollection still living in the heart of the evangelist at the moment of his writing, finds expression. The *tenth hour* may be understood in two ways: either as four o'clock in the afternoon; John would thus reckon the hours as they were generally reckoned among the ancients, beginning from six o'clock in the morning,—we shall see that this is the most natural interpretation in iv. 6, 52, and also in xix. 14;—or as ten o'clock in the morning; he would, thus, adopt the mode of reckoning of the Roman Forum, which has become that of modern nations, and according to which the reckoning is from midnight. *Rettig*, *Ebrard*, *Westcott*, etc., think that the author of our Gospel reckons throughout in this way. It would give a satisfactory account of the expression *that day*. But this expression is also very well explained, if the question is of four o'clock in the afternoon; and that by the contrast with the idea of the mere visit which the two youths had thought of making. Instead of continuing a few moments, the interview was prolonged until the end of the day. Comp. the remarks iv. 6,

[1] Vv. 38, 39 (in the Greek text) are united in our version. Ver. 40 thereby becomes ver. 39, and so on.

[2] T. R. reads ἴδετε (*see*), with ℵ A and 13 other Mjj., almost all the Mnn., It. Vg. Cop., while B C L some Mnn. Syr. and Orig. read ὄψεσθε (*you shall see*).

[3] T. R. with 13 Mjj. omits the οὖν (*therefore*) here, which is read by ℵ A B C L X Δ.

[4] T. R. reads δὲ (*now*) after ὥρα with some Mnn. only.

iv. 52, xix. 14.[1] This indication of the tenth hour has sometimes been applied, not to the moment when the disciples arrived, but that when they left Jesus. In this case, however, John would undoubtedly have added a limiting expression, such as ὅτε ἀπῆλθον, *when they departed*. It is the hour when he *found*, not that when he *left*, that the author wished to indicate. Faith is no sooner born of testimony, than it extends itself by the same means:

Vv. 41, 42. "*Andrew, Simon Peter's brother, was one of the two who heard John's words and followed Jesus.* 42. *As the first, he*[2] *findeth his own brother Simon, and saith to him: We have found the Messiah* (*which means: the Christ*)." At this point of the narrative, the author names his companion Andrew. It is because the moment has come to point out his relationship to Simon Peter, a relationship which exercised so decisive an influence on the latter and on the work which is beginning. The designation of Andrew as *Simon Peter's brother*, is so much the more remarkable, since Simon Peter has not as yet figured in the narrative, and since the surname *Peter* did not as yet belong to him. This future apostle, is, therefore, treated from the first as the most important personage of this history. Let us remark, also, that this manner of designating Andrew assumes a full acquaintance already on the part of the readers with the Gospel history. Did Peter's visit to Jesus take place on the same evening? *Weiss* and *Keil* declare that this is impossible, because of the expression *that day* (ver. 40), which leaves no place for this new visit. *Westcott*, on the contrary says: "All this evidently happened on *the same* day." This second view, which is that of *Meyer* and *Brückner*, seems to me the only admissible one. It follows, by a kind of necessity, from the exact enumeration of the days in this passage. See: *the next day*, vv. 29, 35, 44, and also ii. 1. Towards evening, the two disciples left Jesus for some moments, and Peter was brought by Andrew to Him while it was not yet night.

How are we to explain the expressions "*first*" (or *in the first-place*) and "*his own* brother"? These words have always presented a difficulty to interpreters. They contain, in fact, one of those small mysteries with

[1] We owe to the kindness of M. André Cherbuliez the following points of information: Ælius Aristides, a Greek sophist of the second century, a contemporary of Polycarp, with whom he may have met in the streets of Smyrna, relates in his *Sacred Discourses* (book v.), that on his arrival in that city, he had, during the night, a dream in which the sun, rising over the public square, ordered him to hold, on that same day, a seance for declamation in the Council-hall at the *fourth* hour. This hour, according to the customs of the ancients, could only be ten o'clock in the morning,—the hour which Xenophon calls that of the πληθουσα ἀγορά, when the whole population frequents the public square. So he found the hall quite full. In the first book, the deity having ordered him to take a bath, he chose the *sixth* hour as the most favorable to health. Now it was winter, and it was a cold bath which was in question. The hour was, therefore, that of *noon*. What leaves no doubt on this point, is the fact that he says to his friend Bassus who keeps him waiting: "Seest thou, the shadow is already turning." The ordinary reckoning in Asia, therefore, was from six o'clock in the morning. *Langen* has alleged in favor of the opposite usage a passage from the *Acts* of the martyrdom of Polycarp (c. 7). But this passage appears to us insufficient to prove the contrary of that which follows so plainly from the words of the Greek rhetorician.

[2] Instead of the received reading πρωτος, which is in ℵ L Γ Δ Λ and 8 other Mjj., A B M T[b] X Π some Mnn. Syr. read πρωτον.

which John's narrative, at once so subtle and so simple, is full. The Mjj. which read the adverb or the accusative πρῶτον, are six in number, among them the *Vatican:* "He finds his own brother *first* (or *in the first-place*)." But with what brother would he be contrasted by this *first?* With the disciples who were found later, Philip and Nathanael? But it was not Andrew who found these; Jesus found Philip, and Philip Nathanael. And yet this would be the only possible sense of the accusative or the adverb πρῶτον. The nominative πρῶτος, therefore, must necessarily be read, with the Sinaitic MS. and the majority of the Mjj.: "As the first, Andrew finds his own brother." This might strictly mean that they both set about seeking for Simon, and that Andrew was the first to find him, because, Simon being his brother, he knew better where to seek him; this would in a manner explain the τὸν ἴδιον, *his own*, but in a manner very far-fetched. As it is impossible to make this very emphatic expression a mere periphrasis of the possessive pronoun *his*, the author's thought must be acknowledged to have been as follows: "On leaving, each one of them seeks his own brother: Andrew seeks Simon, and John his brother James; and it is Andrew who first succeeds in finding *his own*." The πρῶτον may have been substituted for πρῶτος under the influence of the four following words in ον.

The term *Messiah*, that is, the *Anointed*, from *maschach, to anoint*, was very popular; it was used even in Samaria (iv. 25). The Greek translation of this title, Χριστός, again implies Greek readers. John had twice employed the Greek term in the preceding narrative (vv. 20 and 25); but here, in this scene of so personal a character, he likes to reproduce the Hebrew title (as he had done at ver. 39, as he is to do again in iv. 25), in order to preserve for his narrative its dramatic character. If we have properly explained this verse, we must conclude from it that James, the brother of John, was also among the young Galilean disciples of John the Baptist, and that John is not willing to name him any more than he is to name himself, or afterwards to name his mother, xix. 25.

Ver. 43. "*And*[1] *he brought him to Jesus. Jesus, looking upon him fixedly, saith, Thou art Simon, son of Jonas,*[2] *thou shalt be called Cephas* (*which means: Peter*)." The pres. *he finds* and *he says* (ver. 42) were descriptive; the aor. *he brought* indicates the transition to the following act: the presentation of Peter. The word ἐμβλέπειν denotes a penetrating glance which reaches to the very centre of the individuality. This word serves to explain the following apostrophe; for the latter is precisely the consequence of the way in which Jesus had penetrated the character of Simon, and had discovered in him, at the first look, the elements of the future Peter. It is not necessary to suppose that Jesus in a *miraculous* way knew the names of Simon and his father; Andrew, in presenting his brother, must have named him to Jesus. Instead of *Jona*, the three principal Alexandrian

[1] ℵ B L reject και (*and*) before ηγαγεν.

[2] ℵ B L Ital[iq] Cop[s] read Ιωαννου instead of Ιωνα which is read in all the other Mjj. and in almost all the Vss.

authorities read *John*. The received reading is, perhaps, a correction according to Matt. xvi. 17 (*son of Jonas*), where there is no variation of reading and where the name Jonas might be itself an abbreviation of Ἰωάννου (*John*), as *Weiss* supposes. A change of name generally marks a change of life or of position. Gen. xvii. 5: "*Thy name shall be no more Abram* (*exalted father*), *but Abraham* (*father of a multitude*)." Gen. xxxii. 28: "*Thy name shall be no more Jacob* (*supplanter*), *but Israel* (*conqueror of God*, in honorable combat)." The Aramaic word *Kêpha* (Hebrew, *Keph*), denotes a piece of rock. By this name, Jesus characterizes Simon as a person courageous enough and decided enough to become the principal support of the new society which He is about to found. There was surely in the physiognomy of this young fisherman, accustomed to brave the dangers of his profession, the expression of a masculine energy and of an originating power. In designating him by this new name, Jesus takes possession of him and consecrates him, with all his natural qualities, to the work which He is going to entrust to him.

Baur regards this story as a fictitious anticipation of that in Matt. xvi. 18; the author, from his dogmatic standpoint hastens to show forth in Jesus the omniscience of the Logos. But the ἐμβλέψας, *having regarded him fixedly*, is by no means consistent with such an intention; and as for the expression: "*Thou art Peter*," Matt. xvi., it implies precisely a previous expression in which Jesus had already conferred this surname upon him. Jesus starts, in each case, from that which is, to announce that which is to be; here: "*Thou art* Simon; thou shalt be Peter;" in Matthew: *thou art* Peter; thou shalt really become what this name declares. Availing himself of the fact that Peter is mentioned here third, *Hilgenfeld* draws up his argument as prosecutor against the author, and says: "Peter is thus deprived by him of the position of the first-called!" And he finds here a proof of the evangelist's ill will towards this apostle. *Reuss* says, with the same idea, "Peter is here very expressly put in the second place." But the designation of Andrew as *Peter's brother* (ver. 41), before the latter has appeared on the scene, and the magnificent surname which Jesus confers upon him at first sight, while no similar honor had been paid to his two predecessors—are there not here, in our narrative, so many points designed to exalt Simon Peter to the rank of the principal personage among all those who formed the original company, who surrounded Jesus? And if this narrative had been invented with the purpose of depreciating Peter, in order to give the first place to John, why make Andrew so prominent and place him even before the latter? And besides, of what consequence is the *order* of arrival here? Does not every unprejudiced reader feel that the narrative is what it is, simply because the event happened thus. Comp., moreover, vi. 68 and xxi. 15–19 for the part ascribed to Peter in this Gospel.

A contradiction has been found between this account and that of the calling of the same disciples in Galilee, after the miraculous draught of fishes (Matt. iv. 18–22; Mark i. 16–20; Luke v. 1–11). *De Wette*, *Brückner*, *Meyer* himself, regard

any reconciliation as impossible, and give preference to the narrative of the fourth Gospel. To the view of *Baur*, on the contrary, it is our narrative which is an invention of the author. *Lücke* thinks that the two narratives can be harmonized; that of John having reference to the call of the disciples to *faith*, that of the Synoptics, to their calling as *preachers* of the Gospel, in conformity with the words: "*I will make you fishers of men.*" The first view cannot positively explain how the Synoptical narrative could arise from the facts related here by John and altered by the oral tradition. Everything is too completely different in the two scenes; the place: here, Judea; there, Galilee; the time: here, the first days of Jesus' ministry; there, a period already farther on; the persons: in the Synoptics, there is no reference either to Philip or Nathanael; on the other hand, James, who is not named here, is there expressly mentioned; the situation: here, a simple meeting; there, a fishing; finally, the mode: here, a spontaneous attachment; there, an imperative summons. The view of Baur, on the other hand, cannot explain how the author of the fourth Gospel, in the face of the Synoptical tradition received throughout the whole Church, could attempt to create a new history in all points of the calling of the principal apostles, and a history which positively glorifies Jesus much less than that of the Synoptics. For instead of gaining His disciples by the manifestation of His power, He simply receives them from John the Baptist. The view of *Lücke* is the only admissible one (see also *Weiss*, *Keil* and *Westcott*). Having returned to Galilee (ver. 44), Jesus went back for a time to the bosom of His own family, which transferred its residence, probably in order to accompany Him, to Capernaum (Matt. iv. 13; John ii. 12; comp. Mark iii. 31). In these circumstances, He naturally left His disciples also to return to the bosom of their families (Peter was married); and He called them again, afterwards, in a complete and decisive manner when the necessities of His work and of their spiritual education for their future task required it. The very readiness with which these young fishermen followed His call at that time (Synoptic account),—leaving, at His first word, their family and their work to unite themselves with Him, implies that they had already sustained earlier relations to Him. Thus the account of the Synoptics, far from excluding that of John, implies it. Let us remember that the Synoptic narratives had for their essential object the *public* ministry of Jesus, and that, consequently, these writings could not omit a fact of such capital importance as the calling of the earliest disciples to the office of preachers. The fourth Gospel, on the contrary, having as its aim to describe the development of apostolic faith, was obliged to set in relief the scene which had been the starting point of this faith. We shall prove in many other cases this reciprocal relation between the two writings, which is explained by their different points of view and aims.

II.—*Second Group:* vv. 44–52.

The following narrative seems to be contrived for the purpose of driving to despair, by its conciseness, the one who attempts to account for the facts from an external point of view. Does ver. 44 express merely the *intention* of setting out for Galilee? Or does it indicate an actual departure? Where and how did Jesus find Philip and Nathanael? Were they also in Judea among the disciples of John the Baptist? Or did He meet

them on His arrival in Galilee?—Evidently, a narrative like this could proceed only from a man pre-occupied above all with the spiritual element in the history which he relates, and who, in consequence, simply sketches as slightly as possible the external side of the facts related. This is the general character of the narrative of the fourth Gospel.

Vv. 44, 45: "*The next day he*[1] *resolved to set out for Galilee, and finds Philip; and Jesus says to him: Follow me.* 45. *Now Philip was of Bethsaida, of the city of Andrew and Peter.*" The aorist, ἠθέλησεν (*wished*), indicates quite naturally, a realized wish. The words: "*He wished to set out and He finds,*" are thus, equivalent to: "*At the moment when* He *decides* to set out, He finds." Here is the juxtaposition of propositions which is so frequent in John (*Introd.*, p. 135). This mode of expression is irreconcilable with the idea that Jesus only met Philip at a later time in Galilee; the latter was, therefore, in the same region with Andrew, John and Peter, and for the same reason. It was of importance to Jesus to surround Himself particularly with young men who had gone through with the preparation of the ministry and baptism of John the Baptist. The notice of ver. 45, intercalated here, gives us to understand that it was through the intervention of the two brothers, Andrew and Peter, that Philip was brought into connection with Jesus. On the other hand, the expression: *He finds*, is incompatible with the idea that they had positively brought him to Him. At the time of His setting out, Jesus probably found him conversing with his two friends; whereupon He invited him to join himself to them. The words, "*Follow me,*" merely signify, "Accompany me on this journey." But Jesus well knew what must result from this union once formed; and it is impossible that this invitation should not have had in His thought a higher import. The verb ἠθέλησεν (*wished*), denotes a deliberate wish, and leads us to inquire what was the motive of the resolution, which Jesus formed, of setting out again for Galilee. *Hengstenberg* thinks that He wished to conform to the prophecies which announced that Galilee would be the theatre of the Messianic ministry. This explanation would give to the conduct of Jesus somewhat of artificiality. According to others, He desired to separate His sphere of action from that of John the Baptist, or also to withdraw from the seat of the hierarchy which had just shown itself unfavorably disposed towards the forerunner. The subsequent narrative (ii. 12–22) appears to me to lead to another solution. Jesus must inaugurate His Messianic ministry at Jerusalem; but, in order to this, He desired to wait for the solemn season of the Passover feast. Before this time, therefore, He decided to return to His family, and to close, in the days which remained until the Passover, the period of His private life.

Ver. 46: "*Philip finds Nathanael and says to him: We have found Him of whom Moses, in the law, and the prophets did write, Jesus, the son of Joseph, of Nazareth.*[2] Philip's part in the calling of Nathanael is like that of Andrew in

[1] T. R. reads here: ο Ιησους with 5 byz., and omits it with 4 of them in the following clause.

[2] T. R. with E F G H K M U V Γ Δ Π: Ναζαρεθ; ℵ A B L X: Ναζαρετ; Δ: Ναζαραθ e: Ναζαρα (see *my Comment. sur l'év. de Luc.*, 2d. ed., t. I., pp. 107, 108.

the calling of Peter, and that of Peter and Andrew in his own. One lighted torch serves to light another; thus faith propagates itself. *Luthardt* sets forth finely the heavy and complicated form of Philip's profession; those long preliminary considerations, that full and formal Messianic certificate, which is in contrast with the lively and unconstrained style of Andrew's profession (ver. 42). The same traits of character are met with again in the two disciples in vi. 1–13, and perhaps also in xii. 21, 22. From the fact that Philip designates Jesus as the *son of Joseph*, and as a native of *Nazareth*, *Strauss*, *de Wette*, and others, conclude that the fourth evangelist either was ignorant of, or did not admit, the miraculous origin of Jesus and His birth at Bethlehem; as if it were the evangelist who was here speaking, and not Philip! And that disciple, after exchanging ten words with Jesus, must have been already thoroughly acquainted with the most private circumstances of His birth and infancy! Is it Andrew and Peter who must have informed him of them? But whence could they have got the knowledge of them themselves? Or Jesus? We must suppose, then, that this was the first thing that Jesus hastened to communicate to them: that He was not the son of the man who was said to be His father, that He was miraculously born! How criticism can become foolish, through its desire of being sagacious! The place where Nathanael was met by Jesus and His disciples, when returning to Galilee, is not pointed out. The most probable supposition is, that they met each other in the course of the journey. Philip, who was his fellow-citizen—Nathanael was also of Cana (xxi. 2)—became the connecting-link between him and Jesus. We may suppose that Nathanael was returning home from the presence of John the Baptist, or that, like all his pious fellow-countrymen, he was going to be baptized by him. At all events, he had just rested for a few moments in the shade of a fig-tree, when he met Jesus and His companions (comp. ver. 48). Ewald wrongly supposes the meeting to have taken place at Cana. The circumstantial account of the calling of Nathanael leads us to believe that he afterwards became one of the apostles: for this is the case with all the disciples mentioned in this narrative. It appears, moreover, from xxi. 2, where the apostles are distinguished from the mere disciples, and where Nathanael is placed among the former. As this name does not figure in the apostolic catalogues (Matt. x. 3; Mark iii. 18; Luke vi. 14; Acts i. 13), it is generally admitted that Nathanael is no other than Bartholomew, whose name is connected with that of Philip in almost all these lists. Bartholomew being only a patronymic (son of Tolmai or Ptolemy), there is no difficulty in this supposition. As for the hypothesis of *Späth*, that Nathanael is a symbolic name (this word signifies *gift of God*), invented by the later author to designate the apostle John, it is one of those fancies of the criticism of the day, which, if it needed any refutation, would be refuted by its insoluble inconsistency with xxi. 2.

Ver. 47: "*And Nathanael said unto him: Can anything good come out of Nazareth? Philip says to him: Come and see.*" According to *Meyer*, Nathanael's answer alludes to the reputation which the town of Naza-

reth had had for immorality; according to *Lücke* and *de Wette*, to the smallness of the place. But there is nothing in history to prove that Nazareth was a place of worse fame, or less esteemed than any other village of Galilee. Nathanael's answer does not at all require such suppositions. Is it not more simple to connect this reply closely with the words of Philip? Nathanael, not recollecting any prophetic passage which ascribes to Nazareth so important a part, is astonished; the more so, since Cana is only at the remove of a league from Nazareth, and it is difficult for him to imagine this retired village, near his own, raised all at once to so high a destiny. We are well aware of the paltry jealousies which frequently exist between village and village. The expression, *anything good*, signifies, therefore, in this case: "anything so eminent as the Messiah!" We notice here, for the first time, a peculiarity of the Johannean narrative: the author seems to take pleasure in mentioning certain objections raised against the Messianic dignity of Jesus, to which he makes no reply because every reader instructed in the Gospel history could dispose of them on the spot (comp. vii. 27, 35, 42, etc.). At the time when John wrote, every Christian knew that Jesus was not actually from Nazareth. The answer of Philip: "*Come and see*," is at once the most simple and the most profound apologetic. To every upright heart Jesus proves Himself by showing Himself. This rests on the truth expressed in ver. 9. (Comp. iii. 21.)

Ver. 48. "*Jesus saw*[1] *Nathanael coming to him and says of him: Behold a true Israelite, in whom there is no guile.*" Nathanael is one of those upright hearts who have only to see Jesus in order to believe in Him; Philip is not mistaken. Jesus Himself, as He sees him, also signalizes in him this quality. Penetrating him, as He had penetrated Simon, he utters aloud this reflection *with regard to him* (περὶ αὐτοῦ): "Behold. . . " We can make the adverb ἀληθῶς, *truly*, qualify ἴδε, Behold *really* an Israelite without guile;" in this case, the idea *without guile* is not placed in connection with the national Israelitish character; it is applied to Nathanael personally. But we can make the adverb ἀληθῶς qualify the word *Israelite:* a true (*truly*) Israelite, and that as being without guile." In that case, it is the national character, as well as that of Nathanael, which Jesus signalizes, and there may be, perhaps, an allusion to the name *Israel* (*conqueror of God*) which was substituted for *Jacob* (*supplanter*), after the mysterious scene, Gen. xxxii., where the new way of struggling took the place, in the patriarch's case, of the deceitful methods which were natural to him. However, vi. 5 and viii. 31, where the adverb qualifies the verb *to be*, must not be cited for this meaning.

Ver. 49. "*Nathanael says to Him: whence knowest thou me? Jesus answered and said to him: Before Philip called thee, when thou wert under the fig-tree, I saw thee.*" This reply by which Nathanael seems to appropriate to himself the eulogy contained in ver. 48 has been criticised as not modest. But he wishes simply to know on what grounds Jesus, who sees him

[1] ℵ alone reads ιδων . . . λεγει.

for the first time, forms this judgment of him. Certainly, if we take account of the extraordinary effect which Jesus' answer produced upon Nathanael (ver. 50), it must contain to his view the indubitable proof of the supernatural knowledge which Jesus has of him. *Lücke* thinks that this knowledge applies only to the inward moral state of Nathanael; *Meyer*, on the contrary, that it applies only to the external fact of his sitting under the fig-tree. But thoroughly to comprehend the relation of this saying of Jesus, on the one side, to his previous declaration (ver. 48), and, on the other, to the exclamation of Nathanael (ver. 50), it is indispensable to unite the two views. Not only does Nathanael note the fact that the eye of Jesus had followed him in a place where His natural sight could not reach him, but he understands that the eye of this stranger has penetrated his interior being, and has discerned there a moral fact which justifies the estimate expressed by Jesus in ver. 48. Otherwise, the answer of Jesus does not any the more justify that estimate, and we cannot understand how it can call forth the exclamation of Nathanael in ver. 50, or be presented, in vv. 51, 52, as the first of the Lord's miraculous works. What had taken place in Nathanael, at that moment when he was under the fig-tree? Had he made to God the confession of some sin (Ps. xxxii. 1, 2), taken some holy resolution, made the vow to repair some wrong? However this may be, serious thoughts had filled his heart, so that, on hearing the word of Jesus, he feels that he has been penetrated by a look which participates in the divine omniscience. The words: *before Philip called thee*, are connected by *Weiss* with what follows, in this sense: "When thou wert under the fig-tree before Philip called thee." But they much more naturally qualify the principal verb: *I saw thee*. And the same is true of the second limiting phrase: "*when thou wert under the fig-tree*," which refers rather to what follows than to what precedes. For the situation in which Jesus *saw him* is of more consequence than that in which Philip *called him*. The construction of *ὑπό*, with the accusative (*τὴν συκήν*), with the verb of rest, is owing to the fact that to the local relation there is joined the moral notion of shelter. *I saw* denotes a view such as that of Elisha (2 Kings v.). In Jesus, as in the prophets, there was a higher vision, which may be regarded as a partial association with the perfect vision of God. At this word, Nathanael feels himself, as it were, penetrated by a ray of divine light:

Ver. 50. "*Nathanael answered and said to him:*[1] *Master, thou art the Son of God; thou art the King of Israel.*" By the title *Son of God*, he expresses the thrilling impression which was made within his mind by the intimate relation between Jesus and God, of which he had himself just had experience. *Lücke*, *Meyer*, and most others maintain that this title is here equivalent to that of Messiah. They regard this as proved by the following expression: *the King of Israel*. But it is precisely this juxtaposition which implies a difference of meaning. At all events, if the two titles had exactly the same sense, the second would be joined to the first as a

[1] B. L. reject και λεγει αυτω; ℵ reads και ειπεν.

simple apposition, while the repetition of the pronoun σύ, *thou*, and of the verb εἶ, *art*, before the second title, absolutely excludes this synonymy. Besides, the title which Nathanael here gives must be the vivid and fresh expression of the moral agitation which he has just experienced, and not, like that of Messiah, the result of reflection. If the latter is added afterwards, it is to do justice to the affirmation of Philip (ver. 46); but still, it can only come in the second place. In general, we believe that the equivalence of the term, Son of God, with that of Messiah, even in the form in which *Weiss* makes it out, who understands by Son of God the man well-beloved of God, never wholly corresponds with reality. In this passage, in particular, the title Son of God, can only be connected with the proof of supernatural knowledge which Jesus has just given, and consequently, it contains the feeling of an exceptional relation between Jesus and God. Undoubtedly, it is a vague impression; but it is, nevertheless, rich and full, as is everything which is a matter of feeling, even more than if it were already reduced to a dogmatic formula. As *Luthardt* observes: "Nathanael's faith will never possess *more* than that which it embraces at this moment" (the living person of Jesus), it will only be able to possess it more distinctly. The seeker for gold puts his hand on an ingot; when he has coined it he has it better, but not more. The two titles complete each other: *Son of God* bears on the relation of Jesus to God; *King of Israel* on His relation to the chosen people. The second title is the logical consequence of the first. The personage who lives in so intimate a relation with God can only be *the King of Israel*. This title is undoubtedly the response to that of *true Israelite*, with which Jesus had saluted Nathanael. The faithful subject has recognized and salutes his King. Jesus feels indeed, that he has just taken the first step in a new career—that of miraculous signs, of which His life had been completely destitute up to this time; and His answer breathes the most elevated feeling of the grandeur of the moment.

Ver. 51. "*Jesus answered and said to him: Because I said unto thee that*[1] *I saw thee under the fig-tree, thou believest; thou shalt see*[2] *greater things than these.*" Since Chrysostom, most interpreters (*Lücke, Meyer*, etc.), editors and translators (*Tischendorf, Rilliet*), give to the words: *Thou believest*, an interrogative sense. They put into this question either the tone of surprise (*Meyer*) because of a faith so readily formed, or even that of reproach (*de Wette*), as if Nathanael had believed before he had sufficient grounds for it. I think, notwithstanding the observations of *Weiss* and *Keil*, that there is a more serene dignity in the answer of Jesus, if it is taken as an affirmation. He recognizes and approves the nascent faith of Nathanael; He congratulates him upon it; but He promises him a succession of increasing miraculous manifestations, of which he and his fellow-disciples will be witnesses, and which from this moment onward will develop their nascent faith. This expression proves that from that day Nathanael re-

[1] ℵ A B G L Syr., etc., read ὅτι before εἶδον.

[2] The T. R. reads ὄψει (Attic form). All the Mjj. with the exception of U Γ read ὄψῃ.

mained with Jesus. Up to this point, Jesus had spoken to Nathanael alone: "*Thou believest . . . thou shalt see.*" What He now declares, although also promised to him, concerns, nevertheless, all the persons present.

Ver. 52. "*And he says to him: Verily, verily, I say unto you, From this time onward*[1] *you shall see the heaven opened and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man.*" We meet for the first time the formula *amen, amen,* which is found twenty-five times in John (*Meyer*), and nowhere else in the New Testament. Matthew says *amen* (not repeated) thirty times. This expression *amen,* serving as an introduction to a declaration which is about to follow, is found nowhere either in the Old Testament, or in the Rabbinical writings. It belongs exclusively to the language of Jesus. Hence is the fact more easily explained that Jesus is Himself called the Amen in the Apocalypse (iii. 14). This word (coming from the Hebrew *aman, firmum fuit*) is properly a verbal adjective, *firm, worthy of faith;* it is used as a substantive in Is. lxv. 16: *Elohé amen,* "the God *of truth.*" It also becomes an adverb in a large number of passages in the Old Testament, to signify: that remains sure; or: let it be realized! This adverb is doubled, as in St. John, in the two following passages: Num. v. 22: "*Then the woman* (accused of adultery) *answered: Amen, amen;* Nehem. viii. 6: *All the people answered: Amen, amen.*" This doubling implies a doubt to be overcome in the hearer's mind. The supposed doubt arises sometimes, as here, from the greatness of the thing promised, sometimes from a prejudice against which the truth affirmed has to contend (for example, John iii. 3, 5).

The words ἀπ' ἄρτι, *from now on,* are rejected by three of the ancient Alexandrian authorities; they were, in general, adopted by the moderns, and by Tischendorf himself who said in 1859 (7th ed.): *cur omissum sit, facile dictu; cur additum, vix dixeris.* But the omission in the Sinaitic MS. has caused him to change his opinion (8th ed.). The rejection can be easily understood, as the Gospel history does not contain any appearance of an angel in the period which followed these first days. It would be very difficult, on the contrary, to account for the addition. *Weiss* and *Keil* allege the words of Matt. xxvi. 64. But there is no resemblance either in situation or thought between that passage and this one, which can explain such an importation; and I persist in thinking, with the Tischendorf of 1859, that the rejection is much more easily explained than the addition. Jesus means to say that heaven, which was opened at the time of His baptism, is not closed. The communication re-established between heaven and earth continues, and the two regions form for the future only one, so that the inhabitants of the one communicate with those of the other; comp. Eph. i. 10 and Col. i. 20. The expression *ascend and descend* is a very clear allusion to the vision of Jacob (Gen. xxviii. 12, 13). There it represented the continual protection of divine providence, and of its invisible agents assured to the patriarch. What the disciples are about to

[1] ℵ B L It. Cop. Orig. omit ἀπ' ἄρτι, which is read by T. R. with all the other Mjj., the Mnn., Syr., etc.

behold from now on will be a higher realization of the truth represented by that ancient symbol. Jesus certainly does not mean to speak of certain appearances of angels which occurred at the close of His life. The question is of a phenomenon which from this moment is to continue uninterruptedly. Most moderns, putting themselves at the opposite spiritualistic extreme to the literal interpretation, see here only an emblem of the heavenly and holy character of the daily activity of Jesus and, as *Lücke* and *Meyer* say, of the living communion between God and His organ, in which the divine forces and revelations are concentrated. *Reuss* says, with the same meaning: "Angels are the divine perfections common to the two persons . . .," together with this observation: "The literal explanation would here be as poor as it is absurd." *Luthardt* (following *Hofmann*): "the (personified) forces of the Divine Spirit." If the explanation of the Fathers was too narrow, that of the moderns is too broad. There is no passage where the spiritual activity of Jesus is referred, even symbolically, to the ministry of angels. It is derived from the Spirit (ver. 32; iii. 34), or, still more commonly, from the Father dwelling and acting in Jesus (vi. 57). Angels are the instruments of the divine force in the domain of nature (see the angel of *the waters*, Apoc. xvi. 5; of the *fire*, Apoc. xiv. 18). This expression refers, therefore, to phenomena, which, while taking place in the domain of nature, are due to a causality superior to the laws of nature. Could Jesus characterize His miracles more clearly without naming them? It is also the only sense which connects itself with what has just passed, even at this moment, between Nathanael and Himself: "Thou believest because of this wonder of *omniscience;* this is only the prelude of more remarkable signs of the same kind." By this Jesus means the works of *power* of which the event that follows, the miracle of Cana, will be the first example (*from now on*). This explanation is confirmed, moreover, by the remarkable parallel, Matt. viii. 9, 10. It is difficult to explain why the angels *who ascend* are placed before those *who descend.* Is it simply owing to a reminiscence of Genesis? But there, there was a special reason: Jacob must understand that the angels were already near him at the moment when he was receiving that revelation. According to *Meyer* and *Lücke*, Jesus would here also mean that, at the moment when the "*you shall see*" shall take place, this relation with heaven shall be already in full activity. I think, rather, that the angels are here presented by Jesus as an army grouped around their chief, the Son of man, who says to one, *Go*, and to another, *Do this.* These servants ascend first, to seek power in the presence of God; afterwards, they descend again to accomplish the work.

Were not these two allusions, one to the name of Israel (ver. 48), the other to the dream of Jacob, suggested by the sight of the very localities through which Jesus was, at this moment, passing? He was going from Judea to Galilee, either by the valley of the Jordan or by one of the two plateaus which extend along that valley on the east and the west. Now *Bethel* was on the eastern plateau, the very locality in which Jacob's dream had occurred, and whose name perpetuated the remembrance of that

event; on the eastern plateau *Mahanaim* was situated (the *double camp* of angels) and *the ford of Jabbok*, two places which equally recalled appearances of angels (Gen. xxxii. 1, 2 and 24 ff.). It is possible that, in passing through these places which were classic for every Israelitish heart, Jesus conversed with His disciples concerning those scenes precisely which they recalled, and that this circumstance was the occasion of the figure which He makes use of at this moment.

What are the purpose and meaning of the expression: *Son of man*, by which Jesus here describes Himself? We examine this question here only in its relation to the context (see the following appendix). It is manifest that this title has a relation to the two titles which Nathanael has just given to Jesus. This is intended to make His disciples sensible of the fact that, besides His particular relation to God and to Israel, He sustains a third no less essential one, His relation to the whole of humanity. It is to this last that this third title refers. By making this designation His habitual title and by avoiding the use of the title of *Christ*, which had a very marked political and particularistic hue, Jesus wished from the first to establish His ministry on its true and broad foundation, already laid by that saying of His forerunner: "who takes away the sin *of the world*." His task was not, as Nathanael imagined, to found the Israelitish monarchy: it was to save the world. He did not come to complete the theocratic drama, but to bring to its consummation the history of man.

This title, thus, completes *the two* others; the three relations of Jesus to *God*, to *men*, and to the *people of Israel* exhaust, indeed, His life and His history.

The Son of Man.

Jesus designates Himself here, for the first time, by the name *Son of man*, and it is quite probable that this occasion was really the first on which He assumed this title. We find it thirty-nine times in the Synoptics (by connecting the parallels: most frequently in Matt. and Luke); ten times in John (i. 52; iii. 13, 14; v. 27 (without the article); vi. 27, 53, 62; viii. 28; xii. 23, 34; xiii. 31). Three very different opinions prevail respecting the meaning, the origin and the purpose of this designation. We can, however, arrange these in two principal classes.

I. Some think that Jesus here borrows from the Old Testament a title in some measure technical, which was adapted to designate Him either as *prophet*—there would thus be an illusion to the name *son of man* by which God often designates Ezekiel, when addressing His word to him—or as *Messiah*, in allusion to Dan. vii. 13: "And I saw one *like unto a son of man* coming on the clouds of heaven." This Messianic prophecy had become popular in Israel, to such an extent that the Messiah had received the name *Anani*, עֲנָנִי, the man of the clouds. It would thus be natural to suppose that Jesus made choice of this term as in a popular way designating his Messianic function; the more so, as there exists a saying of Jesus, in which He solemnly recalls this description of Daniel, applying it to Himself, Matt. xxvi. 64: "Henceforth ye shall see *the Son of man* seated at the

right hand of power and coming on the clouds of heaven." Of these two alleged allusions, the first cannot be sustained. For it is not as a prophet that God calls Ezekiel son of man, but as a creature completely powerless to perform the divine work of which he is inviting him to become the agent—thus, as *a man*. Would it not be contrary to all logic to maintain that, because God on one occasion has called a prophet son of man, it follows that this name is the equivalent of the title prophet.[1]

The allusion to Daniel, as the foundation of this peculiar name of Jesus, is admitted by almost all modern interpreters, *Lücke*, *Bleek*, *Ewald*, *Hilgenfeld*, *Renan*, *Strauss*, *Meyer*, *Keil*, *Weiss*, etc. This is also, apparently, the opinion of M. *Wabnitz*.

If the question were this: Did Jesus, in designating Himself thus, bring together in His own mind this name and the: *as a son of man*, of Daniel? it would seem difficult to deny it, at least as to the time when He proclaimed Himself the Messiah in reply to the high-priest before the Sanhedrim. But this is not the question. The point in hand is to determine whether, in choosing this title as His habitual name, as His title by predilection, Jesus meant to say: "I am the Messiah announced by Daniel." As for myself, I think that this name is rather an immediate creation of His own heart, with which He was inspired by the profound feeling of what He was for humanity. The following are the reasons which impel me to reject the first view; and to prefer the second to it: 1. The borrowings of Jesus from the O. T. have, in general, a character of formal accommodation rather than that of a real imitation. The idea always springs up as perfectly original from His heart and mind; and if He connects it with some saying of Scripture, it is that He may give it support with His hearers, rather than that He may cite it as a source. How, then, could the name of which Jesus, by preference, makes use to designate His relation to humanity be the product of a servile imitation? If anything must have come forth from the depths of His own consciousness, it is this name. 2. Throughout the whole course of the Gospel of John, Jesus, as we shall see, carefully avoids proclaiming Himself as the Messiah, Χριστός, before the people, because He knows too well the political meaning commonly attached to this term, and that the least misunderstanding on this point would have been immediately fatal to His work. He makes use, therefore, of all kinds of circumlocutions to avoid designating Himself as the Messiah: comp. viii. 24, 25; x. 24, 25, etc. Comp. also, in the Synoptics, Luke iv. 41; ix. 21, where he forbids the demons and His disciples to declare Him to be the Christ. And in direct contradiction to this procedure, He would have chosen, for His habitual name, a designation to which the popular opinion had attached this sense of Messiah! 3. Two passages in John prove, moreover, that the name *Son of man* was not generally applied to the Messiah: xii. 34, where the people ask Jesus who this personage is whom He designates by the name Son of man (see the exegesis); and v. 27, where Jesus says that the Father has committed the judgment to Him because He is *Son of man*. Certainly, if this expression had here meant: the Messiah, the article *the* could not have been wanting It was necessary, in that case, since the question was of a personage well-known and designated under this name. Without the article, there is here a mere indication of *quality*:

[1] This explanation presented by *Vernes*, and up to a certain point by *Weizsacker*, has been well refuted in the article of *Wabnitz*, *Revue théol.*, Oct. 1874, pp. 165 f.

God makes Him judge of men as having the quality of man. Besides, let us not forget that in Daniel judgment is exercised, not, as *Renan* wrongly says, by the Son of man, but by Jehovah Himself; and it is only after this act is wholly finished, that the Son of man, to whom the title is given, appears on the clouds.[1] 4. In the Synoptics, also, there are passages where the meaning Messiah does not suit the term Son of man. It is sufficient to cite Matt. xvi. 13, 15, where Jesus asks His disciples: "Who do men say that I, the Son of Man, am? . . . And you, who do you say that I am?" Had this term been equivalent to Messiah, would not the first question contain an intolerable tautology, and would not *Holtzmann* have ground for asking how Jesus, after having designated Himself a hundred times as Son of Man, could still propose to His disciples this question, "Whom do you take me to be?" 5. The appearance of the Son of man in the prophecy of Daniel has an exclusively eschatological bearing. The question is of the glorious establishment of the final kingdom. Now one cannot comprehend how from such a representation, especially, Jesus could have derived the title of which He makes use to designate His person during the period of His earthly abasement. But one can easily understand that, when this title had once been adopted by Him for other reasons, He should have made express allusion to this term employed by Daniel, at the solemn moment when, before the Sanhedrim, He wished to affirm His glorious return and His character as judge of His judges. Let us add, finally, that Daniel had not said: I saw the Son of man, or even a Son of man, but vaguely: *like* [the figure of] a son of man; and could Jesus have derived from such a vague expression His title of Son of man? 6. If we believe the common exegesis, the term Son of God had the sense of Messiah. Now, according to the same exegesis, this also is the meaning of the term Son of man, and it would follow from this that these two titles, which are evidently antithetic, would both have the same sense[2]—a thing which is impossible. They do not, either the one or the other, properly designate the office of the Messiah, but rather two aspects of the Messianic personage, which are complementary of each other.

II. We are led thus to the second class of interpretations, that which finds in this title a spontaneous expression of the consciousness which Jesus had of Himself—some finding the feeling of His greatness expressed in it, and others, the feeling of His humiliation.

1. There is no longer any need of refuting the explanation of *Paulus* and *Fritzsche*, according to which Jesus simply meant to say: This individual whom you see before you · *homo ille quem bene nostis.* Jesus would not, by so exceptional a term, have paraphrased more than fifty times the simple pronoun of the first person.

2. *Chrysostom*, *Tholuck* and others explain this title by a deliberate antithesis to the feeling which Jesus had of His own essential sonship to God. To choose, as His characteristic name, the title of descendant of the human race, He must feel

[1] Undoubtedly, in the passage of the *Book of Enoch* (c. 37–71) the Messiah is several times called Son of man, but not the Son of Man; comp. *Westcott*. Besides, this passage is suspected of Christian interpolations (Oehler, art. *Messias*, in Herzog's *Encycl.* (1st ed.); Keim, *Gesch. Jesu* (II. p. 69). But in any case, if these passages were entirely authentic, the passages in John prove that this designation was not yet a popular one.

[2] To this impossible identification all the efforts tend which *Keim* makes to attenuate the difference between these two terms, II., p. 388.

Himself a stranger by nature to that race. This explanation is ingenious: but only too much so for the simplicity of the feeling of Jesus.

3. *Keerl* thought that Jesus meant to designate Himself thereby as *the eternal man*, pre-existent in God, of whom the Rabbis spoke, the Messiah differing from that heavenly man only through the flesh and blood with which He clothed Himself when He came to the earth. But no others than the Scribes could have attached such a sense to this title which Jesus habitually used, and nothing in His teaching indicates that He Himself shared in that Rabbinical opinion. Moreover, the term Son of man would be very ill adapted to a heavenly man.

4. *Gess* expresses an analogous idea,[1] but less extra-Biblical. According to him, Jesus wished to express thereby the idea of "the divine majesty as having appeared in the form of human life." He rests upon the passages in which divine functions are ascribed to the Son of man, *as such;* thus the pardon of sins (Matt. ix. 6, and parallels), lordship over the angels (Matt. xiii. 41), judgment (Matt. xvi. 27, xxv. 31, John v. 27). But, if the destiny of man is to be exalted even to participate in the functions and works of God, there is nothing in the acts cited which surpasses that sublime destiny, and consequently the limits of the *human* life when it has reached the summit of its perfection. Besides, is the idea of the *Kenosis*, which *Gess* adopts, compatible with that of the divine majesty realized in Jesus—in Jesus in the form of the human life?

5. *De Wette* and others think, on the contrary, that by this name Jesus meant to make prominent the weakness of His earthly state. It seems to us that the words of v. 27 are altogether opposed to this sense. It is not because of the meanness of His earthly state, that the judgment is committed to Christ.

6. Only one explanation remains for us, in itself the most simple and natural one, which in various forms has been given by *Böhme, Neander, Ebrard, Olshausen, Beyschlag, Holtzmann, Wittichen, Hofmann, Westcott, Schaff*, etc., which we have already set forth in the first edition of this work, and which we continue to defend. Jesus meant to designate by this title, in the first place, His complete participation in our human nature. *A* son of man is not the son of such or such a man, but an offspring of the human race of which He presents an example; a legitimate representative. It is in this sense that this expression is used in Ps. viii. 5: "What is man that thou art mindful of him, and the son of man that thou visitest him?" The same is true in the frequent addresses of the Lord to Ezekiel. It is also the same in Dan. vii. 13, where the being who appeared like a Son of man represents the human, gentle, holy character of the Messianic kingdom, just as the wild beasts, which preceded him, were figures of the violent, harsh, despotic character of earthly empires. Jesus, therefore, above all, obeyed the instinct of His love in adopting this designation of His person, which expressed the feeling of His perfect homogeneousness with the human family of which He had made Himself a member. This name was, as it were, the theme of which those words of John: "*the Word was made flesh*," are the paraphrase. But Jesus does not merely name Himself: *a* son of man; *a* true man; He names Himself *the* Son of man; He declares Himself, thereby, *the* true man, the only normal representative of the human type. Even in affirming, therefore, His *equality* with us, He affirms, by means of the article, *the*, His *superiority* over all the other members of the human family, who are simply sons of men; comp.

[1] *Christi Zeugniss von seiner Person*, 1870.

Mk. iii. 28; Eph. iii. 5. To designate Himself thus was, indeed, to affirm, yet only implicitly, His dignity as Messiah. He expressed the idea, while yet avoiding the word whose meaning was falsified. Without saying: "I am the Christ," He said to every man: "Look on me, and thou shalt see what thou oughtest to have been, and what, through me, thou mayest yet become." He succeeded thus in attaining two equally important ends: to inaugurate the pure Messianism separated from all political alloy, and to present Himself as the chief of a kingdom of God, comprehending, not only Israel, but all the human race. This is what has led Böhme to say (*Versuch das Geheimniss des Menschensohns zu enthüllen*, 1839), that the design of Jesus in choosing this designation was to *de-judaize* the idea of the Messiah.

We see with what admirable wisdom Jesus acted in the choice of this designation, the creation of His own consciousness and of His inner life. It was His love which guided Him wonderfully in this matter, as it did in everything. Perhaps His inward tact was directed in this choice by the recollection of the most ancient of all the prophecies—the one which was the germ of the tree of the Messianic revelations: "The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head." As the term ἄνθρωπος, *man*, refers equally to the two sexes, and as the woman represents the human *nature*, rather than the human *individuality*, the term Son of man is not far removed from the term *seed of the woman*. Jesus would designate Himself, thus, as the normal man, charged with accomplishing the victory of humanity over its own enemy and the enemy of God.[1]

THIRD SECTION.

II. 1–11.

The First Miracle.—Strengthening of Faith.

Jesus, after having been declared by John to be the Messiah, manifested Himself as such to His first disciples; an utterance of miraculous knowledge, in particular, had revealed the intimate relation which united Him with God. He now displays His glory before their eyes in a first act of omnipotence; and their faith, embracing this fact of an entirely new order, begins to raise itself to the height of its new object. Such is (according to ver. 11), the meaning of this passage.

His first miracle takes place in the family circle. It is, as it were, the

[1] In the idea which we have just set forth all the explanations of the authors mentioned above, who are different from one another in certain unimportant points, as it seems to me, converge. *Baur:* "A simple man, to whom cling all the miseries which can be affirmed of any man whatever." *Schenkel:* "the representative of the poor." *Holtzmann:* "the one to whom may be applied, in the highest degree, everything which can be said of all other men," or, "the indispensable organic centre of the kingdom of God in humanity." *Wittichen:* "the perfect realization of the idea of man, with the mission of realizing it in humanity." *Colani:* "That man who is the Messiah, but who does not wish to designate himself expressly as such." *Hofmann:* "the man in whom all the history of humanity must have its end." *Neander:* "He who realizes the idea of humanity." *Böhme:* "the universal Messiah." *Westcott:* "a true man and, at the same time, the representative of the race in whom are united the virtual powers of the whole of humanity." I am astonished to see this explanation lightly set aside by *Wabnitz* in these words: "It will be desirable thus to set aside from the immediate historical sense of our title . . . etc."

point of connection between the obscurity of the private life, to which Jesus has confined Himself until now, and the public activity which He is about to begin. All the sweet and amiable qualities by which He has, until now, adorned the domestic hearth, display themselves once more, but with a new brightness. It is the divine impress which His last footstep leaves in this inner domain; it is His royal farewell to His relation as son, as brother, as kinsman.

Ver. 1: "*And the third day there was a marriage in Cana of Galilee, and the mother of Jesus was there.*" A distance of somewhat more than twenty leagues, in a straight line, separates the place where John was baptizing, from Nazareth, to which Jesus was probably directing His course. This journey requires three days' walking. *Weiss*, *Keil*, and others, think that the first of these three days was the day after that on which Jesus had taken the resolution to depart (i. 44). But the resolution indicated by ἠθέλησεν has certainly been mentioned in i. 44 only because it was executed at that very moment. The first day, according to the natural interpretation of the text, is, therefore, that which is indicated in i. 44 as the day of departure. The second is understood; it was, perhaps, the one on which the meeting with Nathanael took place. On the third, the travelers could arrive at a quite early hour in the region of Cana and Nazareth. It was the *sixth* day since the one on which John had given his first testimony before the Sanhedrim (i. 19).—It is affirmed that there are at the present time in Galilee, two places of the name of Cana. One is said to be called *Kana-el-Djélil* (*Cana of Galilee*), and to be situated about two hours and a half to the north of Nazareth; the other is called *Kefr-Kenna* (*village Cana*); it is situated a league and a half eastward of Nazareth. It is there, that, ever since the eighth century, tradition places the event which is the subject of our narrative. Since *Robinson* brought the first into vogue, the choice has been ordinarily in its favor (*Ritter*, *Meyer*); this is the view of *Renan* (*Vie de Jésus*, p. 75). *Hengstenberg* almost alone, has decided for the second, for the reason that the first, as he says, is nothing but a ruin, and has no stable population, capable of preserving a sure tradition respecting the name of the place. What if the name were itself only a fable.[1] In any case, the situation of Kefr-Kenna answers better

[1] Robinson (*Biblical Researches*, ii. pp. 194, 195, 204, f.), relates that he was guided by a Christian Arab named *Abu Nasir*, from Nazareth to the height of the Wely Ismail, whence one has a magnificent view of all the surrounding regions, and that this Arab showed him, from that point, at three leagues' distance towards the northwest, a place called *Kana-el-Djélil*, in the name of which he recognized the *Cana of Galilee* of our Gospel. On the other hand, here are the contents of a note which I made at Nazareth itself, Sept. 26, 1872, after a conversation with a competent European who accompanied us to the Wely Ismail. He declared to us that the real name of the place pointed out to Robinson is *Khurbet-Cana*, and that it was only *from Arabian politeness* (aus arabischer Höflichkeit), that Robinson's guide, yielding at length to the pressing questions of the celebrated traveler, pronounced the desired name of *Kana-el-Djélil*, which does not at all exist in the region. Such is also the result of the work published in the *Palestine Exploration Fund*, No. III., 1869, by J. Zeller, missionary at Nazareth, who gives a very precise description of the two localities in dispute. He shows how the Christian tradition has always connected itself with Kefr-Kenna, where considerable ruins are found,

to our narrative. The date: "*the third day*," covers in fact, the whole of the following passage, as far as ver. 11; consequently, the miracle must have taken place on the very day of the arrival. Now even if he did not arrive at Nazareth until towards evening of the third day, Jesus might still have repaired before night to the very near village of Kefr-Kenna—this would have been impossible in the case of the Cana of Robinson—or even, what is more probable, He reached Kefr-Kenna directly from the south, without having passed through Nazareth. If Nathanael was coming from Cana (xxi. 2) at the time when Philip met him, he might inform Jesus of the celebration of the wedding, and of the presence of His family in that place—a circumstance which induced Jesus to betake Himself thither directly. Let us add that the defining object *of Galilee*, which recurs in iv. 46 and xxi. 2, must have been a standing designation, intended to distinguish this Cana from another place of the same name, situated outside of Galilee (comp. Josh. xix. 28, the place of this name situated on the borders of Phœnicia). This designation would have meaning only as there was but *one* place of this name in Galilee.

The name of the mother of Jesus is not indicated, yet not precisely because John supposes the name to be known to the readers by tradition. It might have been added, even in that case, but because it is in her character of *mother* of Jesus that Mary is to play the principal part in the following narrative. There is no well-founded reason to suppose, with *Ewald*, *Weiss*, and *Renan*, that Mary had already for a long time been settled with her sons at Cana. How, in that case, should not Nathanael, who was of Cana, and Jesus, have been acquainted with each other before their recent meeting? How should the sisters of Jesus have been still dwelling in Nazareth (Mk. vi. 3)? The fact that it is not said that Mary and her sons had repaired from Nazareth to Cana because of the wedding evidently cannot prove anything. The expressions of ver. 1, much more naturally imply that Mary was at Cana only *because of the wedding;* (comp. besides, Philip's word to Nathanael, i. 46: "*of Nazareth*").

Ver. 2. "*Now Jesus also was bidden to the marriage, as well as His disciples.*" There is a contrast between the imperfect, *was there*, which is used in speaking of Mary, and the aorist *was bidden*, applied to Jesus and His disciples. Jesus was bidden only on His arrival, while Mary, at that time, was already there. It appears from all these points that the family in question was quite closely related to that of the Lord; this is likewise proved by the authoritative attitude which Mary assumes in the following scene. The singular, *was bidden*, is owing to the fact that the disciples were not bidden except in honor, and, as it were, in the person, of their Master. *Rilliet*, with some commentators, translates: *had been bidden*. But when? Before going to His baptism (*Schleiermacher*), or later, through a

which are altogether wanting at Khurbet-Cana; then, how a statement of the chronicler Seawulf (1103), and, finally, the whole account of Josephus (*Vita*, 15 and 16), correspond only with Kefr-Kenna. On the other side, Robinson and Raumer cite Quaresmius, and some other chroniclers, in favor of the hypothesis of Khurbet-Cana. But it is a certain fact that the name *Kana-el-Djélil* no longer exists at the present day.

messenger? Two very improbable suppositions. Moreover, the added words: *as well as His disciples*, are incompatible with this meaning. For they could not have been invited before it was known that Jesus had disciples.

Ver. 3. "*And when the wine failed,*[1] *the mother of Jesus saith to Him: They have no wine.*"[2]—The marriage feasts sometimes continued several days, even a whole week (Gen. xxix. 27; Judg. xiv. 15; Tob. ix. 12; x. 1). The failure of the wine is commonly explained by this circumstance. However this may be, it is scarcely possible to doubt that this failure was connected with the unexpected arrival of six or seven guests, Jesus and His disciples. The reading of the *Sinaitic MS.*: "And they had no more wine, for the wine of the wedding-feast was entirely consumed," is evidently a diluted paraphrase of the primitive text?—What does Mary mean by saying to Jesus: "*They have no wine?*" *Bengel* and *Paulus* have thought that Mary wished to induce Jesus to withdraw and thus to give the rest of the company the signal to depart. The reply of Jesus would signify: "What right hast thou to prescribe to me? The hour *for leaving* has not yet come for me." Such an explanation has no need to be refuted. The expression "*my hour*," always used, in our Gospel, in a grave and solemn sense, would be enough to make us feel the impossibility of it. The same thing is true of *Calvin's* explanation, according to which Mary wished "to admonish Jesus to offer some religious exhortation, for fear that the company might be wearied, and also courteously to cover the shame of the bridegroom." This expression, "*They have no wine*," has a certain analogy to the message of the sisters of Lazarus: "*He whom thou lovest is sick.*" It is certainly a tacit request for assistance. But how does it occur to Mary to resort to Jesus in order to ask His aid in a case of this kind? Does she dream of a miracle? *Meyer*, *Weiss* and *Reuss* think not; for, according to ver. 11, Jesus had not yet performed any. Mary, thus, would only think of natural aid, and the reply of Jesus, far from rejecting this request as an inconsiderate claim, would mean: "Leave me to act! I have in my possession means of which thou knowest not, and whose effect thou shalt see as soon as the hour appointed by my Father shall have struck." After this, the order of Mary to the servants, "*Do whatsoever He shall say to you*," presents no further difficulty. But this explanation, which supposes that Mary asks *less* than what Jesus is disposed to do, is contradictory to the natural meaning of the words "*What is there between me and thee?*" which lead rather to the supposition of an encroachment by Mary on a domain which Jesus reserves exclusively to Himself, an inadmissible interference in His office as Messiah. Besides, by what means other than a miracle could Jesus have extricated the bridegroom from his embarrassment? *Meyer* gives no explanation of this point. *Weiss* thinks of friends (like Nathanael) who had relations at Cana, and by means of whom Jesus could

[1] ℵ reads instead of υστερησαντος οινου: και οινον ουκ εἰχον οτι συνετελέσθη ο οινος του γαμου ειτα λεγει, a reading which is found in some documents of the *Itala* (a. b. ff²) and adopted by Tischendorf in the 8th ed.

[2] ℵ οινος ουκ εστι, instead of οινον ουκ εχουσιν.

provide a remedy for the condition of things. But even in this sense we cannot understand the answer of Jesus, by which He certainly wishes to cause Mary to go back within her own bounds, beyond which she had, consequently, just passed. What she wished to ask for, is therefore a striking, miraculous aid worthy of the Messiah. Whence can such an idea have come to her mind? *Hase* and *Tholuck* have supposed that Jesus had already wrought miracles within the limits of His family. Ver. 11 excludes this hypothesis. *Lücke* amends it, by saying that He had simply manifested, in the perplexities of domestic life, peculiar gifts and skill: one of those convenient middle-course suggestions which are frequently met with in this commentator and which have procured for him such vigorous censure on the part of Baur. It affirms, in fact, too much or too little. It seems to me that the state of extraordinary exaltation is forgotten in which, at this moment, that whole company, and especially Mary, must have been. Can it be imagined for an instant, that the disciples had not related everything which had just occurred in Judea, the solemn declarations of John the Baptist, the miraculous scene of the baptism proclaimed by John, the proof of supernatural knowledge which Jesus had given on meeting Nathanael, finally that magnificent promise of greater things impending, of an open heaven, of angels ascending and descending, which their eyes were going *henceforth* to behold? How should not the expectation of the marvelous—that *seeking after miracles*, which St. Paul indicates as the characteristic feature of Jewish piety—have existed, at that moment, in all those who were present, in the highest degree? The single fact that Jesus arrived surrounded by disciples, must have been sufficient to make them understand that a new phase was opening at that hour, that the time of obscurity and retirement had come to its end, and that the period of Messianic manifestations was about to begin. Let us add, finally, with reference to Mary herself, the mighty waking up of recollections, so long held closely in her maternal heart, the return of her thoughts to the marvelous circumstances which accompanied the birth of her son. The hour so long and so impatiently waited for had, then, at last struck! Is it not to her, Mary, that it belongs to give the decisive signal of this hour? She is accustomed to obedience from her Son; she does not doubt that He will act at her suggestion. If the words of Mary are carried back to this general situation, we easily understand that what she wishes is not merely aid given to the embarrassed bridegroom, but, on this occasion, a brilliant act fitted to inaugurate the Messianic royalty. On the occasion of this failure of the wine, she sees the heaven opening, the angel descending, a marvelous manifestation exhibiting itself and opening the series of wonders. Any other difficulty in life would have served her as a pretext for seeking to obtain the same result: "Thou art the Messiah: it is time to show thyself!" As to Jesus, the temptation in the wilderness is here seen reproducing itself in its third form (Luke iv. 9). He is invited to make an exhibition of His miraculous power by passing beyond the measure strictly indicated by the providential call. It is what He can no more do at the prayer of His mother

than at the suggestion of Satan or at the demand of the Pharisees. Hence the tone of Jesus' reply, the firmness of which goes even to the point of severity.

Ver. 4. "*Jesus saith to her: What is there between me and thee, woman? My hour is not yet come.*" Jesus makes Mary sensible of her incompetency in the region into which she intrudes. The career on which He has just entered, is that in which He depends only on His Father; His motto henceforth is: My Father and I. Mary must learn to know in her son the *servant of Jehovah*, of Jehovah only. The expression "*What is there between me and thee?*" is a frequent one in the Old Testament. Comp. Judg. xi. 12; 2 Sam. xvi. 10; 1 Kings xvii. 18; 2 Kings iii. 13. We even meet it, sometimes, in profane Greek; thus the reply of a Stoic to a jester is quoted, who asked him, at the moment when their vessel was about to sink, whether shipwreck was an evil or not: "What is there between us and thee, O man? We perish, and thou permittest thyself to jest!" This formula signifies, that the community of feeling to which one of the interlocutors appeals is rejected by the other, at least in the particular point which is in question. Mary had, no doubt, well understood that a great change was being wrought in the life of her son; but, as often happens with our religious knowledge, she had not drawn from this grave fact the practical consequence which concerned her personally. And thus, as *Bäumlein* says, Jesus finds Himself in a position to reject the influence which she presumes still to exercise over Him. The address *γύναι*, *woman*, is thereby explained. In the language in which Jesus spoke, as well as in the Greek language, this term involves nothing contrary to respect and affection. In Dio Cassius, a queen is accosted by Augustus with this expression. Jesus Himself uses it in addressing His mother at a moment of inexpressible tenderness, when, from His elevation on the cross, He speaks to her for the last time, xix. 26. Here this expression, entirely respectful though it may be, gives Mary to understand, that, in the sphere on which Jesus has just entered, her title of *mother* has no longer any part to play.

"Here for Mary," as Luthardt well observes, "is the beginning of a painful education." The middle point of this education will be marked by the question of Jesus, "*Who is my mother, and who are my brethren?*" (Luke viii. 19 f.) The end will be that second address: *Woman* (xix. 26), which will definitely break the earthly relation between the mother and the son. Mary feels at this moment, for the first time, the point of the sword which, at the foot of the cross, shall pierce through her heart. After having made her sensible of her incompetency, Jesus gives the ground of His refusal. The words: "*My hour is not yet come*" have been understood by *Euthymius*, *Meyer*, *Hengstenberg*, *Lange* and *Riggenbach* (*Leben des Herrn Jesu*, p. 374), in a very restricted sense: "the hour for performing the desired miracle." The following words of Mary to the servants, according to this view, would imply two things: the first, that Jesus received a little later from His Father an inward sign which permitted Him to comply with His mother's wish; and the second, that by a gesture or a word, He

made known to her this new circumstance. This is to add much to the text. Besides, how could Jesus, before having received any indication of His Father's will, have said: "not *yet*," a word which would necessarily mean that the permission will be granted Him later. Finally, this weakened sense which is here given to the expression "*my hour*" does not correspond with the solemn meaning which is attached to this term throughout our whole Gospel. If it were desired to hold to this weakened meaning, it would be still better to give to this clause, with *Gregory of Nazianzum*, an interrogative turn: "Is not the hour (of my emancipation, of my autonomy) *come?*" Let us remark that the expression "*my hour*" is here connected with the verb *is come*, as in all the passages in John where it is taken in its weightiest sense: "*His hour was not yet come*" (vii. 30; viii. 20, comp. xiii. 1); "*The hour is come*" (xii. 23; xvii. 1). His hour, in all these passages, is that of His *Messianic manifestation*, especially through His death and through the glorification which should follow it. The analogous expression *my time*, vii. 6, is also applied to His Messianic manifestation, but through the royal entry into Jerusalem. This is the meaning which seems to me to prevail here. Jesus makes known to Mary, impatient to see Him mount the steps of His throne, that the hour of the inauguration of His Messianic royalty has not yet struck. It is in His capital, Jerusalem, in His palace, the Temple, and not in the centre of His family, that His solemn manifestation as Messiah must take place (Mal. iii. 1: "*And then He shall enter into His temple*"). This sense of the expression "*my hour*" could not be strange to the mind of Mary. How many times, in her conversations with Jesus, she had doubtless herself used this expression when asking Him: Will thine hour come at last? That hour was the one towards which all her desire as an Israelite and a mother moved forward. Jesus rejects Mary's request, but only so far as it has something of ambition. How often in His conversations, He replies less to the question which is addressed to Him than to the spirit in which it is put (comp. ii. 19; iii. 3; vi. 26). He thus lays hold of the person of His interlocutor even in his inmost self. Mary desires a brilliant miracle, as a public sign of His coming. Jesus penetrates this ambitious thought and traces a boundary for Mary's desires which she should no more attempt to cross. But this does not prevent His understanding that along with this, there is something to be done in view of the present difficulty.

Ver. 5. "*His mother says to the servants, Whatsoever he says to you,*[1] *do it.*" Something in the tone and expression of Jesus gives Mary to understand that this refusal leaves a place for a more moderate granting of the desire. Perhaps in this narrative, which is so summary, there is here the omission of a circumstance which the reader may supply for himself from what follows (precisely like that which occurs in xi. 28), a circumstance which gives occasion to the charge of Mary to the servants: "*Do whatsoever He shall tell you.*" How, at this moment of heavenly joy, when Jesus was receiving His Spouse from the hands of His Father, could He have

[1] The MSS. are divided between λεγῃ and λεγει.

altogether refused the prayer of her who, during thirty years, had been taking the most tender care of Him, and from whom He was about to separate Himself forever? Jesus, without having need of any other sign of His Father's will, grants to the faith of His mother a hearing analogous to that which, at a later time, He did not refuse to a stranger, a Gentile (Matt. xv. 25). If criticism has found in the obscurities of this dialogue an evidence against the truth of the account, it is an ill-drawn conclusion. This unique conciseness is, on the contrary, the seal of its authenticity.—By the expression: *Whatsoever He says to you*, Mary reserves full liberty of action to her Son, and thus enters again within her own bounds, which she had tried to overstep.

Ver. 6. "*Now there were there*[1] *six water-pots of stone, according to the usual manner of purifying among the Jews, containing two or three measures apiece.*" Ἐκεῖ, *there*, denotes, according to *Meyer*, the banqueting room itself. Is it not more natural to imagine these urns placed in the court or in the vestibule at the entrance of the hall? The ninth verse proves that all this occurred out of the bridegroom's sight, who was himself in the room. These vases were designed for the purification either of persons or utensils, such as was usual among pious Jews, especially before or after meals (Matt. xv. 2; Luke xi. 38; particularly, Mk. vii. 1–4.)—Κατά, not *with a view to*, but according to its natural sense, *in conformity with*. This preposition has reference to the complement τῶν Ἰουδαίων: *conformably* to the mode of purification customary *among the Jews*. John expresses himself thus because he is writing among Gentiles and as no longer belonging to the Jewish community. Ἀνά has evidently, considering the very precise number *six*, the distributive sense (*singulae*), not the approximative meaning (*about*). The measure which is spoken of was of considerable size; its capacity was 27 *litres* (*Rilliet*) or even 38 (*Keil*) or 39 (*Arnaud*). The entire contents might, therefore, reach even to about 500 *litres*. [The *litre* is a measure nearly corresponding with the English quart.] This quantity has seemed too considerable, it has even scandalized certain critics (*Strauss*, *Schweizer*), who have found here an indication of the falsity of the account. *Lücke* replies that all the water was not necessarily changed into wine. This supposition is contrary to the natural meaning of the text; the exact indication of the capacity of the vessels certainly implies the contrary. Let us rather say that when once Jesus yields to the desire of His mother, he yields with all His heart, as a son, a friend, a man, with an inward joy. It is His first miraculous sign; it must give high testimony of His wealth, of His munificence, of the happiness which He has in relieving, even in giving gladness; it must become the type of the fullness of grace, of joy and of strength which the only-begotten Son brings to the earth. There is, moreover, nothing in the text to lead us to suppose that all the wine must have been consumed at this feast. It was the rich wedding gift by which the Lord honored this house where He with his attendants had just

[1] Κειμεναι placed by T. R. after ἐξ according to the majority of the MSS. and Vss., is put after Ἰουδαιων in B C L, and is altogether wanting in ℵ.

been hospitably received. Perhaps the number *six* was expressly called to mind, because it corresponded precisely with the number of persons who accompanied Jesus. This gift was thus, as it were, a testimony of the gratitude on the part of the disciples themselves to their host; it was, at all events, the enduring monument of the Master's benediction upon the youthful household formed under His auspices. How can criticism put itself in collision with everything that is most *truly human* in the Gospel? Moreover, what a feeling of lively pleasure is expressed in the following words! Jesus foresees the joyous surprise of His host:

Vv. 7, 8. "*Jesus says to them, Fill the water-pots with water. And they filled them up to the brim.* 8. *And he says to them, Draw out now and bear unto the ruler of the feast. And they bore it.*"[1] We should not understand γεμίσατε, *fill*, in the sense of *filling up*, nor allege in support of this meaning the words ἕως ἄνω, *up to the brim;* the matter thus understood has something repugnant in it. Either the urns were empty in consequence of the ablutions which had taken place before the repast, or they were beginning by emptying them, in order to fill them afterwards anew. The: *up to the brim* serves to make the ardor with which the work was done apparent. The moment of the miracle must be placed between vv. 7 and 8; since the transformation is presupposed as accomplished by the word *now* of ver. 8. This *now*, as well as the words: *bear it*, breathes a spirit of overflowing joy and even gaiety. The person here called *ruler of the feast* was not one of the guests; he was the chief of the servants: it belonged to his office to taste the meats and drinks before they were placed upon the table. He ordinarily bears in Greek the name τραπεζοποιός.

Vv. 9, 10. "*When the ruler of the feast had tasted the water which was made wine—and he knew not whence it came, but the servants who had drawn the water knew—the ruler of the feast calls the bridegroom,* 10, *and says to him, Every one serves first the good wine, and when men have become drunken, then*[2] *that which is worse; thou*[3] *hast kept the good wine until now.*" The words ὕδωρ οἶνον γεγεννημένον, *the water become wine*, admit of no other sense than that of a miraculous transformation. The natural process by which the watery sap is transformed every year in the vine-stock (*Augustine*), or that by which mineral waters are formed (*Neander*), offers, indeed, a remote analogy, but not at all a means of explanation. The parenthesis which includes the words καὶ οὐκ . . . ὕδωρ presents a construction perfectly analogous to that of i. 10 and vi. 21–23. This parenthesis is designed to make the reality of the miracle apparent, by reminding the reader, on the one hand, that the servants did not know that it was wine which they were bearing, and on the other, that the ruler of the feast had not been present when the event occurred. *Weiss* makes the clause καὶ οὐκ ᾔδει πόθεν ἐστίν also depend on ὡς, and commences the parenthesis only with οἱ δέ . . . This is undoubtedly possible, but less natural as it seems to me. He calls the bridegroom; the latter was in the banqueting hall.

[1] Instead of και ηνέγκεν, ℵ B K L some Mnn. Cop. read οι δε ηνεγκαν.

[2] ℵ B L some Mnn. omit τοτε (*then*).

[3] ℵ G A some Mnn. and Vss. read συ δε instead of συ.

Some have desired by all means to give a religious import to the pleasantry of the ruler of the feast, by attributing to it a symbolic meaning; on one side, the world, which begins by offering to man the best which it has, to abandon him afterwards to despair; on the other, God, always surpassing Himself in His gifts, and, after the austere law, offering the delicious wine of the Gospel. There was by no means anything of this sort in the consciousness of the speaker, and no indication appears that the evangelist attached such a sense to the words. This saying is simply related in order to show with what entire unreservedness Jesus gave Himself up to the common joy, by giving not only abundantly but excellently. There is here, also, one of the rays of His δόξα (*glory*). For the rest, it is not at all necessary to weaken the sense of μεθυσθῶσι, *to be drunken*, in order to remove from the guests at the wedding all suspicion of intemperance. This saying has a proverbial sense, and does not refer to the company at Cana.

Ver. 11. "*This first*[1] *of his miracles Jesus did in Cana of Galilee*[2], *and he manifested his glory, and his disciples believed on him.*" John characterizes under four important relations the miracle which he has just related. 1. This was *the first*, not only of the miracles performed at Cana, but of all the miracles of Jesus. As here was a decisive moment in the revelation of the Lord and in the faith of the disciples, John brings out this fact with emphasis. The Alexandrian authorities have rejected the article τήν before ἀρχήν, without doubt as being superfluous on account of ταύτην. But, as is frequently the case with them, when desiring to correct, they spoil. Without the article, the attention is rather drawn to the *nature* of the miracle: "It was by this prodigy that Jesus began to work miracles." By the article the notion itself of a beginning is more strongly emphasized: "*That fact* . . . was the true beginning . . . " The second of these ideas is as thoroughly an essential element in the context, as we shall see, as the first is foreign to it. 2. John recalls a second time, in closing, the *place* where the event occurred. The design of this repetition cannot be purely geographical. We shall see, in iii. 24 and iv. 54, how anxious John was to distinguish between the two returns of Jesus to Galilee (i. 44 and iv. 1–3), which had been united in one by tradition, and this is the reason why he expressly points out how the *one* and the *other* of these two returns was signalized by a miracle accomplished at Cana. According to *Hengstenberg*, the defining words *of Galilee* recall the prophecy of Is. viii. 23–ix. 1, according to which the glory of the Messiah was to be manifested in Galilee. This aim would be admissible in Matthew; it seems foreign to the narrative of John. 3. John indicates the *purpose* of the miracle. He uses here, for the first time, the term *sign* (σημεῖον) which is in harmony with the following expression: "*He manifested His glory.*" The miracles of Jesus are not mere wonders (τέρατα), designed to strike the imagination. A close relation exists between these marvelous acts and

[1] The T. R. reads with the majority of the Mjj. among them ℵ, and the Mnn., την before αρχην. A B L T^{b} Δ and Orig. reject this article.

[2] ℵ adds πρωτην after Γαλιλαιας.

the person of Him who performs them. They are visible emblems of what He is and of what He comes to do, and, as *Reuss* says, "radiant images of the permanent miracle of the manifestation of Christ." The glory of Christ is, above all, His dignity as Son and the eternal love which His Father has for Him. Now this glory is, in its very nature, concealed from the eyes of the inhabitants of the earth; but the miracles are the brilliant *signs* of it. They manifest the unlimited freedom with which the Son disposes of all things, and thus demonstrate the perfect love of the Father towards Him: "*The Father loveth the Son and hath given all things into His hands*" (iii. 35). The expression "*His* glory" makes a profound distinction between Jesus and all the divine messengers who had accomplished like wonders before Him. In the miracles of the other divine messengers the glory of Jehovah is seen (Exod. xvi. 7); those of Jesus reveal His own, by bearing witness in concert with His words, to His filial position. The expression *His glory* contains, moreover, all of His own that Jesus puts into the act which He has just performed, the love full of tenderness with which He makes use of divine omnipotence in the service of His own. 4. John, finally, sets forth the *result* of this miracle. Evoked at first by testimony, faith was strengthened by personal contact with Jesus, its object. Now in the course of this personal relation, it makes such experience of the power and goodness of Him to whom it is attached, that it finds itself thereby immovably confirmed. Doubtless it will grow every day in proportion as such experiences shall multiply; but from this moment it has passed through the three essential phases of its formation: testimony, personal contact and experience. This is what John expresses by the words: "*And his disciples believed on him.*" These glorious irradiations from the person of Jesus, which are called miracles, are, therefore, designed not only, as apologetics often assume, to strike the eyes of the still unbelieving multitude and to stimulate the delaying, but, especially, to illuminate the hearts of believers, by revealing to them, in this world of suffering, all the riches of the living object of their faith.

What took place in the minds of the other witnesses of this scene? John's silence leads us to suppose that the impression produced was neither profound nor enduring. This is because the miracle, in order to act efficaciously, must be understood *as a sign* (vi. 26), and because to this end certain moral predispositions are necessary. The impression of astonishment which the guests experienced, not connecting itself with any spiritual need, with any struggle of conscience, was soon effaced by the distractions of life.

On the Miracle of Cana.

Objections of two sorts are raised against the reality of this event: the one class bear on miracles in general; the other, on this one in particular. We do not concern ourselves with the first. We think there is nothing more opposed to the sound method—the method called experimental—than to begin by declaring, as a principle, the impossibility of a miracle. To say that *there has never been* a miracle until now,—be it so. This is a point for examination. But to say that there

cannot be one, is to make metaphysics, not history; it is to throw oneself into the *à priori*, which is repudiated.[1]

The objections which relate especially to the miracle of Cana are:

1. Its *magical* character (*Schweizer*). The difference between the magical and the miraculous is, that, in the former, the supernatural power works *in vacuo*, dispensing with already existing nature, while in the second, the divine force respects the first creation and always connects its working with material furnished by it. Now, in this case, Jesus does not use His power to create, as Mary undoubtedly was expecting; He contents Himself with transforming that which is. He remains, thus, within the limits of the Biblical supernatural.

2. The *uselessness* of the miracle is made an objection. It is "a miracle of luxury," according to Strauss. Let us rather say with *Tholuck*, "a miracle of love." We think we have shown this. It might even be regarded as the payment of a double debt: to the bridegroom, for whom the Lord's arrival had caused this embarrassment, and to Mary, to whom Jesus, before leaving her, was paying His debt of gratitude. The miracle of Cana is the miracle of filial piety, as the resurrection of Lazarus is that of fraternal affection. The symbolic interpretations, by means of which it has been desired to explain the purpose of this miracle, seem to us artificial: to set the Gospel joy in opposition to the ascetic rigor of John the Baptist (*Olshausen*); to represent the miraculous transformation of the legal into spiritual life (*Luthardt*). Would not such intentions betray themselves in some word of the text?

3. This miracle is even charged with *immorality*. Jesus, it is said, countenanced the intemperance of the guests. "With the same right one might demand," answers *Hengstenberg*, "that God should not grant good vintages because of drunkards." The presence of Jesus and, afterwards, the thankful remembrance of his hosts would guarantee the holy use of this gift.

4. The *omission* of this story in the Synoptics seems to the adversaries the strongest argument against the reality of the event. But this miracle belongs still to the family life of Jesus; it does not form a part of the acts of His public ministry. Moreover, as we have seen, it has its place in an epoch of the ministry of Jesus, which, by reason of the confusion of the first two returns to Galilee, had disappeared from the tradition. The aim of John in restoring this event to light was precisely to re-establish the distinction between these two returns and, at the same time, to recall one of the first and principal landmaks of the development of the apostolic faith (comp. ver. 11).

Do not a multitude of proofs demonstrate the fragmentary character of the oral tradition which is recorded in the Synoptics? How can we explain the omission in our *four* Gospels of the appearance of the risen Jesus to the five hundred? And yet this fact is one of the most solidly attested (1 Cor. xv. 6).

If we reject the reality of the miracle as it is so simply related by the evangelist, what remains for us? Three suppositions:

1. The *natural* explanation of *Paulus* or of *Gfrörer:* Jesus had agreed with a tradesman to have wine brought secretly, during the feast, which He caused to be served to the guests *mixed with water*. By His reply to Mary, ver. 4, He wishes to induce her simply not to injure the success of the entertainment which He has

[1] On miracles in general, comp. *Introd.*, p. 87 and the author's Conferences on *the Miracles of Jesus Christ*, and on the *Supernatural*.

prepared, and *the hour* for which *has not yet come*, through an indiscretion. "The glory of Jesus (ver. 11), is the exquisite humanity which characterizes His amiable proceeding (*Paulus*). Or it is to Mary herself that the honor of this attention is ascribed. She has had the wine prepared, in order to offer it as a wedding present; and at the propitious moment she makes a sign to Jesus to cause it to be served (*Gfrörer*). *Renan* seems not far from adopting the one or the other of these explanations. He says in vague terms: "Jesus went willingly to marriage entertainments. One of His miracles was performed, it is said, to enliven a village wedding" (p. 195). *Weiss* adopts a form of the natural explanation which is less incompatible with the seriousness of Jesus' character (see above on ver 3): nevertheless, he acknowledges that John believed that he was relating a miracle and meant to do so. But could this apostle, then, be so completely deceived respecting the nature of a fact which he himself related as an eye-witness? Jesus must, in that case, have intentionally allowed an obscurity to hover over the event, which was fitted to deceive His nearest friends. The seriousness of the Gospel history protests against these parodies which end in making Jesus a village charlatan. 2. The *mythical* explanation of *Strauss:* Legend invented this miracle after the analogy of certain facts related in the Old Testament, e. g. Exod. xv. 23 ff., where Moses purifies bitter waters by means of a certain sort of wood; 2 Kings ii. 19, where Elisha does something similar. But there is not the least real analogy between these facts and those before us here. Moreover, the perfect simplicity of the narrative, and even its obscurities, are incompatible with such an origin. "The whole tenor of the narrative," says *Baur* himself (recalling the judgment of de Wette), "by no means authorizes us to assume the mythical character of the account." 3. The *ideal* explanation of *Baur*, *Keim*, etc. According to the first, the pseudo-John made up this narrative as a pure invention, to represent the relation between the two baptisms, that of John (the water) and that of Jesus (the wine). According to the second, the evangelist invented this miracle on the basis of that saying of Jesus: "Can the friends of the *bridegroom* fast while the bridegroom is with them. . . . They put *new wine* into new bottles" (Matt. ix. 15, 17). The water in the vessels represents, thus, the insufficient purifications offered by Judaism and the baptism of John. The *worse* wine, with which ordinarily the beginning is made, is also Judaism, which was destined to give place to the better wine of the Gospel. The delay of Jesus represents the fact that His coming followed that of John the Baptist. His *hour* is that of His death, which substitutes for the previous imperfect purifications the true purification through the blood of Christ, in consequence of which is given the joyous wine of the Holy Spirit, etc. . . . In truth, if our desire were to demonstrate the reality of the event as it is simply related by John, we could not do it in a more convincing way than by explanations like these, which seem to be the parody of criticism. What! shall this refined idealism, which was the foundation and source even of the narrative, betray itself nowhere in the smallest word of the story! Shall it envelop itself in the most simple, prosaic, sober narrative which carries conciseness even to obscurity! To our view, the apostolic narrative, by its character of simplicity and truth, will always be the most eloquent defender of the reality of the fact.[1]

[1] We refrain here from answering *Schweizer*, who attacked the authenticity of this passage, but has withdrawn his hypothesis. (See Introd. p. 27).

Before leaving this first cycle of narratives, we must further take notice of a judgment of *Renan* respecting this beginning of our Gospel (p. 109): "The first pages of the fourth Gospel are incongruous notes carelessly put together. The strict chronological order which they exhibit arises from the author's taste for apparent precision." But exegesis has shown, on the contrary, that if there is a passage in our Gospels where all things are linked together and are strictly consecutive, not only as to time, but also as to substance and idea, it is this one. The days are enumerated, the hours even mentioned: it is the description of a continuous week, answering to that of the final week. More than this: the intrinsic connection of the facts is so close that *Baur* could persuade himself that he had to deal with an ideal and systematic conception, presented under an historic form. The farther the Gospel narrative advances, the more does Renan himself render homage to its chronological exactness. He ends by taking it almost exclusively as a guide for his narration. And the beginning of such a story, whose homogeneity is evident, is nothing but an accidental collection of "notes carelessly put together!" This, at all events, has little probability.

SECOND CYCLE.

II. 12–IV. 54.

This second cycle is naturally divided into three sections: 1. The ministry of Jesus in *Judea*, ii. 12–iii. 36; 2. The return through *Samaria:* iv. 1–42; 3. The settling in Galilee, iv. 43–54. We shall see that to these three geographical domains three very different moral situations correspond. Hence the varied manner in which Jesus reveals Himself and the different reception which he meets.

FIRST SECTION.

II. 12–III. 36.

Jesus in Judea.

Here again, as in the preceding story, the course of the narrative is steadily continuous and its historical development accurately graduated. Jesus first appears in the *temple* (ii. 12–22); later He teaches in the *capital* (ii. 23–iii. 21), finally, He exercises His ministry in the *country* of Judea (iii. 22–36).

I. *Jesus in the Temple:* ii. 12–22.

Ver. 12. "*After this, he went down to Capernaum,*[1] *he and his mother and his brethren*[2] *and his disciples,*[3] *and they abode there not many days.*"[4] From Cana Jesus undoubtedly returned to Nazareth. For it was the latter place

[1] ℵ B T^{b} X It$^{pler.}$: Καφαρναουμ, instead of Καπερναουμ which T. R. reads with the 19 other Mjj.

[2] B L T^{b} It$^{alq.}$ Orig. omit αυτου after αδελφοι.

[3] ℵ It$^{pler.}$ omit και οι μαθηται αυτου (confusion of the two αυτου).

[4] Instead of εμειναν, A F G Δ Cop. read εμεινεν (*he abode*).

which He had in view when returning from Judea, rather than Cana to which He was only accidentally called. *Weiss* finds this hypothesis arbitrary. He prefers to hold that the family of Mary had already before this left Nazareth to settle in Cana. It seems to me that this is the supposition which merits precisely the name of an arbitrary one (see on ver. 1). From Nazareth Jesus and His family removed at that time to Capernaum, as is related also by Matthew, iv. 13: "*Having left Nazareth, He came and dwelt at Capernaum.*" It is only necessary to recognize the fact that Matthew unites in one the first two returns to Galilee (John i. 44 and iv. 1–3), which John so accurately distinguishes. From his point of view, *Weiss* is obliged to see in our twelfth verse only the account of a mere visit, which was made by Jesus' family from Cana to friends at Capernaum. But what purpose does it serve to mention a detail so insignificant and one which would not have had any importance? Jesus' *mother* and *brethren* accompanied Him. No doubt, under the impression produced by the miracle of Cana, and by the accounts of the disciples, His family were unwilling to abandon Him at this moment. They all desired to see how the drama which had just opened would unfold. This detail of John's narrative is confirmed by Mark vi. 3, from which it appears that the sisters of Jesus, probably already married, had *alone* remained at Nazareth, and by Mark iii. 21–31, which is most naturally explained if the brothers of Jesus were settled with Mary at Capernaum. As for Jesus, He had not, for the time, the intention of making a prolonged stay in that city. It was only later, when He was obliged to abandon Judea, that He fixed His ordinary residence at Capernaum, and that that place became His own city (Matt. ix. 1). We may discover in the words of Luke iv. 23 an indication of this brief visit, previous to His settlement in that city. Thus a considerable difficulty in the narrative of Luke would be resolved and the accuracy of his sources would be verified in respect to one of the points most assailed in his narrative. Capernaum was a city of considerable commerce. It was located on the route of the caravans which passed from Damascus and from the interior of Asia to the Mediterranean. There was a custom-house there (Luke v. 27 f.). It was, in some sort, the *Jewish* capital of Galilee, as Tiberias was its Gentile or Roman capital. Jesus would have less narrow prejudices to meet there than at Nazareth, and many more opportunities to propagate the Gospel. The word *κατέβη, went down*, is due to the fact that Cana and Nazareth were situated on the plateau, and Capernaum on the shore of the lake.[1] The

[1] It does not seem that authorities are near to an agreement on the question of the site of Capernaum. The old opinion named *Tell Hum* at the northern extremity of the lake. There are ruins there, undoubtedly, but by no means a copious spring of water such as that which Josephus mentions and to which he even gives the name Capernaum, Κεφαρνώμη (*Bell. Jud.* iii. 10, 8). *Keim*, following *Robinson*, pleads energetically in favor of *Khan-Minyéh*, about a league south-west of *Tell-Hum*. But at that place there is no abundant spring, for the little neighboring fountain, *Ain-et-Tin*, which issues from the base of the rock a few paces from the lake, cannot answer to the description of Josephus, and cannot have served to irrigate the country. *Caspari* and *Quandt* have good grounds, therefore, for proposing the site of *Ain-Mudawara*, a magnificent basin of water

silence preserved respecting Joseph leads to the supposition that he had died before this period. Before calling His disciples to follow Him definitely, Jesus, no doubt, granted them the satisfaction of finding themselves once more, like Himself, in the family circle. It was from that circle that he called them again. (See p. 361.)

What is the true meaning of the expression: *the brethren of Jesus?* This question, as is well known, is one of the most complicated ones of the Gospel history. Must we understand by it brothers, in the proper sense of the word, the issue of Joseph and Mary and younger than Jesus? Or sons of Joseph, the issue of a marriage previous to his union with Mary? Or, finally, are we to hold that they are not sons either of Joseph or of Mary, and that the word *brother* must be taken in the broad sense of *cousins?* From the exegetical point of view, two reasons appear to us to support the first of these three opinions: 1. The two passages, Matt. i. 25: "He knew her not *until she* brought forth her *first-born* son" (or, according to the Alexandrian reading "*her son*"), and Luke ii. 7: "she brought forth her *first-born* son." 2. The proper sense of the word *brothers* is the only natural one in the phrase: *his mother and his brethren.* The following appendix will give a general exposition of the question.

The Brethren of Jesus.

The oldest traditions, if we mistake not, unanimously assign *brothers* to Jesus, and not merely cousins. They differ only in this point, that these brothers are, according to some, sons of Joseph and Mary, younger brothers of Jesus; according to others, children of Joseph, the issue of a first marriage. The idea of making the brothers of Jesus in the New Testament *cousins*, seems to go no further back than Jerome and Augustine, although *Keim* (I., p. 423) claims to find it already in Hegesippus and Clement of Alexandria. (Comp. on this question, the excellent dissertation of *Philip Schaff: Das Verhältniss des Jacobus, Bruders des Herrn, zu Jacobus Alphaei*, 1843.) Let us begin by studying the principal testimonies: *Hegesippus*, whom Eusebius (ii. 23) places "in the first rank in the apostolical succession," writes about 160: "James, the Lord's brother, called the Just from the times of Christ even to our days, then takes in hand the administration of the Church with the apostles (*μετὰ τῶν ἀποστ.*)." It clearly follows from these words: *with the apostles*, that Hegesippus does not rank James, the Lord's brother, among the apos-

in the centre of the plain of Gennesaret, half a league west of Khan-Minyeh. *Renan* objects that Capernaum must have been situated on the lake-shore (*παραθαλασσία*, Matt. iv. 13). But Ain-Mudawara is only a quarter of a league distant from the shore of the lake (comp. Mark v. 21, Matt. ix. 9). Only we do not find ruins in this district. Are we then to think of *Ain-Tabigah*, between Tell-Hum and Khan-Minyeh? This is the opinion expressed in *Heydenheim's Vierteljahrschrift*, 1871, pp. 533–544. A powerful spring is found there which may have served the purpose of irrigating the country by aqueducts, such as one which supplies, at the present time, the mill which is placed on this spot. But here also no ruins have been discovered up to the present hour. As for *Bethsaida*, there is the same uncertainty. Some think of *Ain-Tabigah*, others of *Et-Tin*. *Quandt* even expresses an opinion in favor of *El-Megdil* (*The Tower*), which is ordinarily regarded as the *Magdala* of the Gospel. In this case, we must, with this writer, locate Magdala, together with the district of *Dalmanutha*, southward of Tiberias. —Comp. my Comment *sur l' évang. de Luc*, I. p. 301 f.; Eng. Trans. I., p. 365.

tles, and consequently distinguishes him from the two *apostles* of this name, the *son of Zebedee*, and *the little* (*less*), son of Alphæus. Now, if Alphæus is the Greek form of the Aramæan name *Clopas* (חלפי = Κλωπᾶς), a name which, according to Hegesippus, was that of the brother of Joseph, it follows from this, that, this last James being the cousin of the Lord, the first could be only His brother, in the proper sense.

The distinction which Hegesippus established between the three Jameses is confirmed by an expression quoted from him in the same chapter of Eusebius: "For there were *several* persons called James (*πολλοὶ Ἰάκωβοι*)." The word *πολλοί* (*several*), implies that he supposed there were more than two Jameses.

Eusebius relates (iii. 11), that after the martyrdom of James the Just, the first bishop of Jerusalem, "Simeon, *the son of Clopas*, who was the Lord's *cousin* (*ἀνεψιός*), was chosen as his successor." For, Eusebius adds: "Hegesippus relates that Clopas was the brother of Joseph." By this expression: *the son of Clopas*, Simeon's relationship to Jesus is evidently distinguished from that of James; otherwise, Eusebius would have said: who was *also* the son of Clopas, or at least: who was the brother *of James*. Hegesippus did not, therefore, consider James as the son of Clopas, nor, consequently, as the Lord's *cousin;* he regarded him, therefore, as His brother in the proper sense of the word.

Eusebius (iii. 32), quotes, also, the following words of Hegesippus: "Some of these heretics denounced Simeon, the son of Clopas . . . In the time of Trajan, the latter, *son of* the Lord's *uncle* (*ὁ ἐκ τοῦ θείου τοῦ κυρίου . . .*), was condemned to the cross." Why designate Simeon by the expression: *son of the Lord's uncle*, while James was always called, simply, *the Lord's brother*, if they were brothers, one of the other, and related to the Lord in the same degree? The principal passage of Hegesippus is cited by Eusebius (iv. 22): "After James had suffered martyrdom, like the Lord, Simeon, born of *His uncle* (*θείου αὐτοῦ*), son of Clopas, was appointed bishop, having been chosen by all as a second cousin of the Lord (*ὄντα ἀνεψιὸν τοῦ κυρίου δεύτερον*)." If we refer the pronoun *αὐτοῦ* (*His* uncle), to James, the question is settled: Simeon was the son of James' uncle, consequently, James' cousin, and not his brother; and James was, therefore, not the cousin, but the brother of Jesus. If we refer the *αὐτοῦ* to the Lord Himself, it follows, as we already know, that Simeon was the son of Jesus' uncle, that is to say, His cousin. The last words of Hegesippus carry us still further. Simeon is called the *second* cousin of Jesus; who was the *first?* It could not be James the Just, as *Keim* thinks. Everything that precedes prevents our supposing this. As constantly as Simeon is called *cousin* of Jesus, so constantly is James the Just designated as His *brother*. How would this be possible, if they were brothers to each other? It appears to me that the *first* cousin of Jesus (the eldest son of Clopas), could have been only the apostle James (the little) the son of Alphæus. He, as an apostle, could not be head of a particular flock, or consequently, bishop of Jerusalem. This was, then, the second cousin of Jesus, to whom they turned after the death of James the Just. Thus, everything is harmonious in the account of Hegesippus, and the identification of the name Alphæus and Clopas, which is at the present day called in question, is confirmed by this ancient testimony.[1] This result is

[1] The identification of the two names Alphæus and Clopas is, at the present day, called in question again for different reasons. *Holtzmann*, for example, prefers to derive the second of these names from the Aramaic word *culba—hammer* (*Jacob der Gerechte und seine*

also confirmed by the words of Hegesippus respecting Jude, *the brother of James* (Jude ver. i.): "There existed, also, at that time, grandsons of Jude, called *His brother* (brother of the Lord) *according to the flesh*" (Euseb. iii. 20). This expression: *brother of the Lord according to the flesh*, applied to Jude, clearly distinguishes his position from that of Simeon.[1]

The opinion of *Clement of Alexandria* may appear doubtful. This Father seems (Euseb. ii. 1) to know only two Jameses: 1. The son of Zebedee, the brother of the Apostle John; 2. The Lord's brother, James the Just, who was at the same time the son of Alphæus, and the *cousin* of Jesus. "For there were two Jameses," he says, "one, the Just, who was thrown from the pinnacle of the temple . . . , the other, who was beheaded (Acts xii. 2)." Nevertheless, Clement may very well have passed in silence James, the son of Alphæus, of whom mention is only once made in the Acts, and who played no part in the history of the Church with which this Father here occupies himself. Clement, moreover, seems to derive his information respecting James from Hegesippus himself (Schaff, p. 69). Now we have just ascertained the opinion of the latter.[2] Tradition recognizes, therefore, the existence of *brothers of Jesus*, and particularly of these two: James and Jude. But are they children of Joseph, the issue of an earlier marriage, or sons of Joseph and Mary?

The former opinion is that of the author of an apocrypal writing, belonging to the first part of the second century, the *Protevangelium Jacobi*. In chap. ix. Joseph says to the priest who confides Mary to him: "I have *sons*, and am old." At chap. xvii.: "I have come to Bethlehem to have *my sons* registered," etc. Origen accepted this view. In his Homily on Luke vii., translated by Jerome, he says: "For these sons, called sons of Joseph, were not born of Mary." (See the other passages in Schaff, p. 81 f.) It follows, however, from his own explanations that this opinion rested, not on an historical tradition, but on a double dogmatic prejudice: that of the moral superiority of celibacy to marriage, and that of the exceptional holiness of the mother of Jesus (comp. especially the passage *ad Matth.* xiii. 55). Several apocryphal Gospels—those of Peter, Thomas, etc., as well as several Fathers, Gregory of Nyssa, Epiphanius, etc., spread abroad this opinion. But Jerome charges it with being *deliramentum apocryphorum*.

The other view is found in the following authorities: *Tertullian* evidently admits brothers of Jesus in the strict and complete sense of the word. For he says, *de Monog.* c. 8: "The virgin was not married until after having given birth to the Christ." According to *Jerome* (*adv. Helvid.*), some very ancient writers spoke of sons of Joseph and Mary, and they had already been combated by Justin; a fact, which proves to what a high antiquity this opinion goes back.[3]

Brüder, in the *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1880). The philological scruples, however, which are raised, do not seem to me sufficient to overthrow what results from the simple and plain tradition of Hegesippus.

[1] Before these facts, *Keim's* affirmation (I., p. 423) falls to the ground: "Hegesippus makes James and Simeon . . . cousins of Jesus." (Comp. the same assertions: Schenkel's *Bibellexic.*, I., p. 482.)

[2] *Eusebius* himself certainly distinguished James, the Lord's brother, from James, the son of Alphæus, since in his Commentary on Is. xvii. 5 (Montfaucons *Coll. nova patr.*, II., p. 422), he reckons *fourteen* apostles: the well-known twelve . . . , then Paul . . . , then James, the Lord's brother, first bishop of Jerusalem. But respecting the manner in which the latter was related to the Lord, the passage ii. 1, leaves us in doubt (see the various reading). The thought of Eusebius on this subject does not seem to me to be clear.

[3] We do not here allege testimonies of so late a time as that of the letter of the pseudo-Ignatius to the Apostle John, or that of the *Apostolical Constitutions*, viii. 35 (see Schaff).

Whatever preference should be given to the one or the other of these two relationships, the difference between the *brothers* and *cousins* of Jesus remains established from the historical point of view.

This now is the difficulty which it raises: The names of Jesus' brothers, mentioned in Matt. xiii. 55; Mark vi. 3, are *James, Joses* (according to the various readings, *Joseph* or *John*), *Simon* and *Judas*. Now, according to John xix. 25, comp. with Matt. xxvii. 56 and Mark xv. 40, Mary, the wife of Clopas, aunt of Jesus, had two sons, one named *James* (in Mark, James *the little*), the other *Joses*, who were, consequently, two cousins of Jesus. Moreover, Hegesippus makes Simeon, the second bishop of Jerusalem, a *son of Clopas;* he was, therefore, also a cousin of Jesus. Finally, Luke vi. 14–16 speaks of an apostle *Judas* (son or brother) of *James* who is mentioned as son of *Alphæus* (or *Clopas*). He would, thus, be a fourth cousin of Jesus, and the two lists would coincide throughout! Four brothers and four cousins with the same names! Is this admissible? But 1. As to the Apostle Judas, the natural ellipsis in Luke's passage is not *brother*, but *son* of James—consequently of some James unknown to us. This designation is designed merely to distinguish this apostle from the other Judas, Iscariot, whose name follows. Jesus had then, indeed, a brother named Judas, but not a cousin of this name. 2. The statements of Hegesippus certainly force us to admit a cousin of Jesus by the name of Simon. 3. If, for the second brother of Jesus, we adopt the reading *Joseph*, the identity of name with that of the third cousin falls to the ground of itself. 4. As to the name James, it is undoubtedly found in the two lists. The actual result, therefore, is this: In these two lists, that of the *brothers*, and that of the *cousins* of Jesus, there are two names in common: those of James and Simon. Is this sufficient to prove the identity of these two categories of persons? Even in our day, does it not happen, especially in country places, that we find families related to one another, in which, among several children, one or two bear certain very familiar names in common?

Notice, on the other hand, two positive exegetical reasons in favor of the distinction between the brothers and the cousins of Jesus: 1. Without doubt, assuming the premature death of Clopas, we could understand how his widow and her sons might have been received by Joseph and Mary, and the latter brought up with Jesus, and in this way their designation as *brothers of Jesus* could be explained. But is it conceivable that, in presence of the fact that the mother of these young persons was still living (Matt. xxvii. 56 and parall.), the expression would have been used in speaking of Mary and her nephews, "*His mother and His brethren*," as it is used in our Gospels (Matt. xii. 46; Mark iii. 31; Luke viii. 19)? 2. The surname, *the little*, given to James, the cousin of Jesus (Mark xv. 40), must have served to distinguish him from some other member of his family, bearing the same name. Is it not probable that this other James was precisely James, his cousin, the brother of Jesus?

We conclude, therefore, that Jesus had four brothers strictly so called: James, surnamed the Just, Joseph, Simon and Judas,—and three cousins: James, the little, Simon and Joses.

No one of His brothers was an apostle; a fact which accords with vii. 5: "*Not even did his brethren believe on him.*" Being converted later, after His resurrection (1 Cor. xv. 5), they became, one of them (James), the first bishop of Jerusalem (Gal. i. 19; ii. 9; Acts xv; xxi. 18 ff.); the others, zealous missionaries (1 Cor. ix. 5). James and Judas are undoubtedly the authors of our two canonical

Epistles. As for the cousins of Jesus, one only was an apostle, James (the little); the second, Simon, was the second bishop of Jerusalem. Of Joses, the third, we know nothing.[1]

It is perhaps not impossible to place in this first visit at Capernaum some of the facts appertaining, according to the Synoptical narratives, to the first period of the Galilean ministry. The calling of the disciples, following upon the miraculous draught of fishes, takes its place naturally here. At the time of His setting out for Jerusalem, Jesus called them to follow Him for ever. He was going to inaugurate His work, and He must have desired to be surrounded from that time by those whom He had the design of associating in it. This twelfth verse is not, therefore, the close of the preceding narrative, as *Weiss* thinks. It is, at the same time, the indication of the moment when Jesus passed from private life to His public ministry. Like His disciples, He separates Himself from His family in order to begin the Messianic work. Moreover, this narrative is so summary, that if the whole of Jesus' life were not presupposed as known to the readers, it would resemble an enigma.

We have to consider in the following event: 1. The act of the Lord: vv. 13–16; 2. The effect produced: vv. 17–22.

Vv. 13–16.

It was at Jerusalem and in the temple, that the Messiah's ministry must open. "The Lord whom ye seek," Malachi had said (iii. 1–3), "shall enter *into his temple* . . . . he *shall purify* the sons of Levi . . ." That prophecy said to Israel that her King would announce Himself, not by a miracle of power, but by an act of holiness.

The moment of this inauguration was naturally indicated. The feast of the Passover, more than any other, assembled the whole people in the holy city and in the courts of the temple. This was *the hour* of Jesus (ver. 4). If the people had entered into the reformatory movement which He sought, at that time, to impress upon them, this entrance of Jesus into His temple would have become the signal of His Messianic coming.

The temple had three particularly holy courts: that of the *priests*, which enclosed the edifice of the temple properly so-called (*ναός*); more to the eastward, that of the *men*, and finally, to the east of the latter, that of the *women*. Around these courts a vast open space had been arranged, which was enclosed on four sides by colonnades, and which was called the *court of the Gentiles*, because it was the only part of the sacred place (*ἱερόν*) into which proselytes were permitted to enter. In this outermost court there were established, with the tacit consent of the temple authorities, a market and an exchange. Here were sold the different kinds of animals intended for the sacrifices; here Greek or Roman money, brought from

[1] Why is Mary, the wife of Clopas (Mark xv. 40), called the mother of James and Joses, and not of Simon? This is a fact not easy to explain.

foreign regions, was exchanged for the sacred money with which the capitation-tax determined by Exod. xxx. 13 for the support of the temple (the half-shekel or double-drachma = about 31 cents) was paid.

Until this day, Jesus had not risen up against this abuse. Present in the temple as a simple Jew, He did not have to judge the conduct of the authorities, still less to put himself in their place. Now, it is as the Son of Him to whom this house is consecrated, that He enters into the sanctuary. He brings to it, not merely new rites, but new duties. To keep silence in the presence of the profanation of which religion is the pretext, and at which His conscience as a Jew and His heart as the Son revolt, would be to belie, at the outset, His position as Messiah. The word of Malachi, which we have just quoted, traces His course for Him. It is to misconceive gravely the meaning of the act which is about to be related, to see in it, with *Weiss*, only a simple attempt at reform, such as any prophet might have allowed himself. The single expression: "*My Father's* house" (ver. 16), shows that Jesus was here acting in the full consciousness of His Messianic dignity; comp. also ver. 19. Vv. 19–21, make us appreciate the true bearing of this act; it is an appeal to the conscience of Israel, a demand addressed to its chiefs. If this appeal is heard, this act of purification will inaugurate the general reform of the theocracy, the condition of the Messianic kingdom. If the people remain indifferent, the consequences of this conduct are clear to the view of Jesus; all is over with the theocracy. The rejection of the Messiah, His death even; this is the fatal end of such conduct. Comp. an analogous ordeal at Nazareth, Luke iv. 23–27. The power in virtue of which Jesus acted, was by no means, therefore, the alleged *right of the zealots* of which the act of Phineas (Num. xxv.; Ps. cvi. 30) is thought to have been the type, but which never really existed in Israel.

Ver. 13. "*And*[1] *the Passover of the Jews was near, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem.*" John says: *of the Jews*, with reference to his Gentile readers, with whom he identifies himself in the feeling of Christian communion.

Ver. 14. "*And he found in the temple those who sold oxen and sheep*[2] *and doves, and the money-changers sitting.*" The article *the* before the terms designating the sellers and money-changers, which *Ostervald* omits with other translators, sets forth this office as a known one; they are *the* habitual, and in a sense licensed sellers and money-changers. The three sorts of animals mentioned were the ones most habitually used for the sacrifices.—Κερματιστής, *money-changer*, from κέρμα, *piece of money*.

Ver. 15. "*And having made*[3] *a small scourge of cords, he drove them all out of the temple, both the sheep and the oxen; and he poured out the changers' money*[4] *and overthrew*[5] *their tables.*" This scourge was not an instrument, but an emblem. It was the sign of authority and of judgment. If it

[1] ℵ alone reads δε instead of και.

[2] ℵ alone reads και τα προβ. και βοας.

[3] ℵ alone reads εποιησεν . . . και (*he made* and . . .)

[4] B L T^b X Orig. read τα κερματα, instead of το κερμα.

[5] Instead of ανεστρεψεν, B X: ανέτρεψεν: ℵ: κατεστρεψεν.

had been a matter of performing a physical act, the means would have been disproportionate to the end, and the effect would be even more so to the cause. The material use of the scourge had no place. The simple gesture was enough.—Πάντας, *all*, includes, according to many (comp. *Bäumlein*, *Weiss*, *Keil*), only the two following objects connected by τε καί, "all, both *sheep* and *oxen*." But it is more natural to refer πάντας to τοὺς πωλοῦντας, *the sellers*, which precedes, and to make of the following words a simple apposition: "He drove them all out, *both sheep and oxen*." The design of the τε καί, *as well as*, is certainly not to indicate by a lifeless disjoining of parts the contents of the word *all*, but to express the sort of bustle with which men and animals hastened off at His command and at the gesture which accompanied it. *He overturned*, with His own hand.—Κολλυβιστής, *money-changer*, from κόλλυβος, *nummus minutus*.—τὸ κέρμα, singular taken in the collective sense.

Ver. 16. "*And he said to those that sold the doves: take these things hence; make not my Father's house a house of merchandise.*" With regard to the sellers of doves Jesus limits Himself to speaking. He cannot drive out the doves, as one drives oxen or sheep; and He does not wish to overturn the cages, as He has overturned the tables of the money-changers. He is perfectly master of Himself. If He had really struck the dealers in oxen and sheep, we cannot see why He should have spared the sellers of pigeons. The command "*take away*" is addressed only to these last; the following words, "*make not, . . .*" to all the traffickers. The defining phrase, "*of my Father*," contains the explanation of Jesus' act. He is a son who avenges the honor of the paternal house. When He was in the temple at the age of twelve, it was already the same filial feeling which animated Him; but on this day He is sustained by the distinct consciousness of His duty as Messiah, involved henceforth for Him in His position as Son. It is very remarkable that in the Synoptics (the scene of the baptism), no less than in John, the feeling of His filial relation to God takes the lead in Jesus of that of His office as Messiah. He does not feel Himself to be Son because He is Christ; He knows Himself to be Christ because He is Son (comp. *my Comment. on Luke* I., p. 235). Here is an indication which is incompatible with the opinion of Renan, who represents Jesus as exalting Himself by degrees and raising Himself by degrees from His Messianic consciousness to the consciousness of His divinity.

The outward success of this judicial act is explained by the majesty of Jesus' appearance, by the irresistible ascendency which was given to Him by the consciousness of the supernatural force which He could exert at need, by the feeling of His sovereignty in that place, as it betrays itself in the expression "*my Father*," and, finally, by the bad conscience of those who were the objects of such a judgment.

Vv. 17–22.

The effect is described in vv. 17–22. We meet here a fact, which will repeat itself at every manifestation of the Lord's glory; a twofold impres-

sion is produced, according to the moral predisposition of the witnesses; some find in the act of Jesus nourishment for their faith; for others the same act becomes a subject of offense. It is the pre-existing moral sympathy or antipathy that determines the impression.

Ver. 17. "*His disciples remembered*[1] *that it was written: The zeal of thy house shall eat me up.*"[2] This recollection took place immediately; comp. ver. 22, where the opposite fact is expressly pointed out. Ps. lxix., the ninth verse of which presents itself at this moment to the remembrance of the disciples, is only indirectly Messianic—that is to say, the subject contemplated by the Psalmist is not the person of the Messiah (comp. ver. 6: "*Thou knowest my foolishness, and my sins are not hid from thee*"), but the theocratic righteous person, suffering for the cause of God. The highest realization of this ideal is the Messiah. *Weiss* claims that this quotation finds an explanation only so far as this Psalm was, at that time, exclusively, and through an error, referred to the Messiah. But in order to this, the reading of ver. 6 must have been forgotten. The unanimity of the Mjj. decides in favor of the reading καταφάγεται. This verb is a future; the evangelist substitutes it for the past κατέφαγε, *hath eaten up*, of the LXX. which is in conformity with the Hebrew text. The disciples are thinking, not of Jesus' last sufferings, which were at that time beyond the thoughts which occupied their minds, but on the consuming force of His zeal, on that living holocaust, the first act of which they beheld at this moment. This also is the meaning of the word *hath eaten up*, in the Psalm.

While the disciples compare the Scriptures, and this remembrance strengthens their faith, the Jews reason and object, just as the inhabitants of Nazareth do, Luke iv. 22. Instead of letting the act of Jesus speak, as every manifestation of holiness should, to their conscience, they demand the external sign which should legitimate this act, as if it did not contain in itself its own legitimation!

Ver. 18. "*The Jews, therefore, answered and said unto him: What sign showest thou unto us, that thou doest these things?*" The particle, *therefore*, connects again with ver. 16, after the interruption in ver. 17. The expression "*the Jews*" designates here especially the authorities charged with the care of the temple, with the shade of hostility which attaches to this term in our Gospel (see i. 19). *Riggenbach* ("*Leben des Herrn Jesu*," p. 382) observes that "it is, indeed, the method of Pharisaism to demand a σημεῖον, an external sign, to legitimate an act which commends itself to the conscience by itself alone, because, once on this path, one can cavil about the nature and value of the sign, can move on indefinitely from demand to demand, and can ask finally, after a multiplication of loaves: *What sign doest thou then?* Ἀποκρίνεσθαι does not signify here, any more than elsewhere, *to take up the discourse* (*Osterwald, Rilliet, Arnaud*). This word always contains the idea of *reply;* only the reply is sometimes addressed to the conduct or the feeling of the interlocutor. Here the Jews' question is

[1] ℵ B L T[b] X Cop. Orig. omit δε after ἐμνήσθησαν.

[2] The T. R. reads κατεφαγε (*hath eaten up*) with several Mnn. It., instead of καταφαγεται (*shall eat up*) which all the Mjj. read

an answer to the act of Jesus; Jesus had just addressed an appeal to the religious sentiment of the people. The attitude of the people, thus called upon to declare themselves, in some sort decided fatally their future. The reply was significant. The nineteenth verse will show us that Jesus immediately penetrated its whole meaning.—Ὅτι: "What sign showest thou (to explain) *that* thou art doing . . . " Meyer: εἰς ἐκεῖνο ὅτι.

Ver. 19. "*Jesus answered and said unto them: Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up.*" This answer of Jesus is sudden, like a flash of lightning. It springs from an immeasurable depth; it illuminates regions then completely unexplored by any other consciousness than His own. The words: *Destroy this temple*, characterize the present and future conduct of the Jews in its innermost significance, and the words: *In three days I will raise it up*, display all the grandeur of the person and of the future work of Jesus. This mysterious saying involves the following difficulty: on the one hand, the connection with what precedes prompts us to refer the words, *this temple*, to the temple properly so called, which Jesus had just purified; on the other, the evangelist's interpretation (ver. 21) obliges us to apply them to the body of Jesus. Some, as *Lücke* and *Reuss*, cut the Gordian knot by declaring that there is a conflict which cannot be settled between scientific exegesis and the apostle's explanation, and by determining that there is an advance of the first beyond the second. *Baur* administers a severe lecture to Lücke for irreverence towards the apostolic exegesis, of which this view gives evidence. In fact, according to Baur, this saying being partly the creation of the evangelist himself, he must know better than any one, better than Lücke, what is its true meaning!

The *historical* truth of this saying of Jesus is guaranteed: 1. By the declaration of the false witnesses (Matt. xxvi. 61; Mark xiv. 57, 58), which proves that, although the recollection of the circumstances in which it was pronounced may have been effaced, the expression itself had remained deeply engraved on the memory, not only of the disciples, but of the Jews. 2. By Acts vi. 14, where Stephen's accusers said: "*We have heard him say that this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place and shall change the customs which Moses gave to us.*" Stephen could not have spoken thus except on the foundation of a positive declaration of Jesus. 3. By the originality, the conciseness, and even the obscurity of the saying.

The first clause cannot contain an invitation to the Jews directly to destroy the temple, not even in the hypothetical sense of *de Wette*: "If you should destroy." This supposition would be absurd; no Israelite would have thought of laying his hand on the sacred edifice. The word *destroy* should, therefore, be taken in the indirect sense: to bring about, by continuing in the course which you are following, the destruction of the theocracy and that of the temple. But what is the offense by which Israel can provoke this final chastisement? Modern interpretation,—"scientific exegesis," as *Lücke* says,—answers: By continually increasing moral profanations, such as that against which Jesus had just protested. This answer is insufficient. Simple sins of this kind could prepare, but

not decide, this catastrophe. The Old Testament assigns a more positive cause for the final ruin of Israel; it is the rejection and murder of the Messiah. Zechariah announces this crime, when describing (xii. 10) the mourning of the Israel of the last days, lamenting the murderous sin against Jehovah *whom they have pierced.* Daniel, chap. ix., says: "*The Messiah shall be cut off. . . . and the people of a prince who shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary;*" a passage which Matthew (xxiv. 15, 16) applies to the circumstances of his time. The means for Israel of destroying its temple, are, to the view of Jesus, to put the Messiah to death. The appearance of the Messiah is the purpose of the theocratic institution. The Messiah being once cut off, it is all over with Israel and consequently with the temple. The people and the priesthood may indeed still exist for a while after this; but all this is nothing more than *the carcase over which the eagles of the divine judgment gather themselves* (Matt. xxiv. 28). Why, at the moment when Jesus expires, is the veil of the temple rent? It is because, in reality, there is no longer a Most Holy place, no longer a Holy place, no longer courts, sacrifice, priesthood; the temple, as Jehovah's temple, has ceased to exist.

When He says "*Destroy this temple,*" therefore, it is, indeed, of the temple properly so called, that Jesus speaks; but He knows that it will be *in His own person,* that this destruction, so far as it depends on the Jews, will be consummated. It is *on His body* that they will cause the blow to fall, which will destroy their sanctuary. The imperative λύσατε is not, then, merely concessive: "If it happens that you destroy." It is of the same kind with that other imperative, "*What thou hast to do, do quickly*" (xiii. 27). When the fruit of perversity, collective or individual, is ripe, it *must* fall. Comp. also the πληρώσατε, Matt. xxiii. 32.

The meaning of the second clause follows from that of the first. If the death of Jesus is the real destruction of the temple, the restoration of the latter can consist only in the resurrection of Jesus Himself. Jesus once said: "*Here is more than the temple*" (Matt. xii. 6). His body was the living and truly holy dwelling of Jehovah; the visible sanctuary was the anticipatory emblem of this real temple. It is, therefore, really, in Him, in *His body,* that this supreme crisis will be effected. The Messiah perishes; the temple falls. The Messiah lives again; the true temple rises again; in a new form, beyond doubt. For in the Kingdom of God, there is never a simple restoration of the past. He who speaks of rising anew speaks of progress, reappearance in a higher form. The word ἐγείρειν, *to waken up, to raise up,* is perfectly suitable here. For it may be applied at once to a resurrection and a construction (see *Meyer*). The expression: *in three days,* the authenticity of which is guaranteed in a very special way by the statement of the false witnesses (διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν, Matt. xxvi. 61; Mark xiv. 58), receives in our explanation its natural meaning; for, in an historical situation so solemn as this, it is impossible to see only a poetic or proverbial form for saying: "in a very short time," as Hos. vi. 2, or Luke xiii. 31. A demonstrative miracle has been demanded of Jesus, as a sign of His competency. We know from the Synoptics that Jesus

always rejected such demands, which renewed for Him the third temptation in the wilderness.

But there was a miracle, one only, which He could promise, without condemning Himself to the role of a wonder-worker, because this miracle entered as a necessary element into the very work of salvation: it was His resurrection. Thus it is to this sign that He in like manner appeals, in similar cases, in the Synoptics (Matt. xii. 38–40; xvi. 4). We come also here upon one of those profound analogies which, beneath the difference of the forms, blend into one whole the representation of the Synoptics and that of John. It is by the *reparative* power which He will display, when the Kingdom of God shall have sunk down, in a sense, even to nothing, that Jesus will prove the competency for *reformation* which He has just arrogated to Himself at this hour. This explanation answers thus to the natural meaning of the expressions of the text, to the demands of the context, and finally to the evangelist's interpretation.

The following is the meaning at which modern exegesis has arrived, by following, as *Lücke* says, "the laws of philological art." It is best set forth, as it seems to us, by *Ewald* (*Gesch. Christi*, p. 230): "All your religion, resting upon this temple, is corrupted and perverted; but He is already present, who, when it shall have perished as it deserves, shall easily restore it in a more glorious form, and shall thus work, not one of those common miracles which you ask for, but the grandest of miracles." In this explanation, the temple destroyed is Judaism; the temple raised up is Christianity; the act of raising it up is Pentecost, not the resurrection. We shall not say that this sense is absolutely false; it is so only so far as it is given as the exact expression of the thought of Jesus at this moment. What condemns it is: 1. That the transformation of the economy of the letter into that of the Spirit is not *a sign*, but the work itself. It is necessary that the event indicated by Jesus should have an external character, in order to be adapted to the demand which was addressed to Him; 2. It is impossible, from this point of view, to interpret naturally the words: *in three days*. The passages (Hos. vi. 2 and Luke xiii. 31) do not sufficiently justify the figurative sense which must, in that case, be given to them here; 3. The temple raised up would be entirely different from the temple destroyed; but the pronoun *αὐτόν* (*it*), demands that there should, at least, be a relation between the one and the other (the body of Jesus destroyed and raised again). Objection is made to the meaning which we have proposed, that the Jews could not have understood so mysterious a reply. Assuredly, they did not see in the temple, of which Jesus spoke, anything but the material edifice, and they represented to themselves the sign promised by Him as the magical appearance of a new and supernatural temple (Mark xiv. 58). But we shall see that, in dealing with evil-disposed persons, the method of Jesus is to throw out enigmas and to reveal the truth only while veiling it; comp. the explanation of Jesus respecting the use of parables (Matt. xii. 11–16). Here is a secret of the profoundest pedagogics.

Objection is also made, that Jesus could not, so long beforehand, know

of His death and resurrection. But in the Synoptics, also, He very early announces the tragical end of His Messianic ministry. It is during the first days of His activity in Galilee, that He speaks of the time "when the *bridegroom will be taken away*, and when the disciples will fast" (Mark ii. 19, 20). Had Jesus, then, never read Is. liii., Dan. ix., Zech. xii., etc.? Now, if He foresaw His death, He must have been assured also of His resurrection. He could not suppose that the bridegroom would be taken away, not to be restored.

Finally, it is objected, that, according to the Scriptures, it is not Jesus who raised Himself. But the receptivity of Jesus, in the act of His resurrection, was not that of passivity. He says Himself (x. 17, 18): "*I give up my life, that I may take it again . . . I have the power to give it up, and I have the power to take it again.*" He lays hold, as in all His miracles, of the divine omnipotence, and this becomes thereby active in Him.

Renan has seen in this utterance, so original and so profound, only a whim: "One day," he says, "His ill-humor against the temple drew from Him an imprudent word." He adds: "We do not know, indeed, what sense Jesus attached to this word, in which His disciples sought forced allegories" (*Vie de Jésus*, p. 367). Where Renan sees a proof of the ill-humor of Jesus against the temple, the immediate witnesses found one of the zeal for the house of God, which devoured their Master. Which has better understood Jesus? As for the explanation given by John (ver. 21), we shall hope that every serious reader will find in it something else than a "forced allegory."

Weiss does not think it is possible to defend the complete authenticity of the expression of Jesus, as it has been preserved for us by John. If Jesus expressed Himself thus, he must, at the same time, have pointed to His body with His finger, and this gesture would have been sufficient to render the misapprehension of the Jews (ver. 20) impossible. Besides, the interpretation which Mark gives of the saying of Jesus (xiv. 58), leads one to suppose that its real meaning was a little different from that which we find in John. To the demand of the Jews relative to His *competency* to purify the temple (ver. 18), Jesus is said to have answered, that for the outward temple He would substitute the habitation of God in the spirit. It was John, according to *Weiss*, who introduced afterwards into the quite simple answer of Jesus, the two ideas of His death and His resurrection. This hypothesis could be taken into consideration only if the difficulty presented by the saying of Jesus, as we have it, were insurmountable. But we believe that we have shown that it is not so. At the foundation, the true ground of this supposition is, that according to this author, Jesus must not have predicted beforehand His death and resurrection.

How did Jesus discover in this question, apparently so innocent: "*What sign showest thou?*" the prelude of the catastrophe which was to put an end to His own life, and, by that means, to the theocracy itself? We know from ii. 3, 4, with what penetration Jesus seized upon the moral bearing of the words which were addressed to Him. We have also cited Luke iv. 22, where it was enough for Jesus to hear the critical reflection on the part of the inhabitants of Nazareth: "*Is not this the son of Joseph?*" in order to His announcing to them His near rejection, not only on their part (ver. 23), but on the part of the whole people (vv. 24–27).

In the most fugitive impression of His interlocutors, the perspicacious eye of Jesus discerned the principle of the great final decision. By this characteristic feature, also, we verify in the Jesus of the Synoptics and of John, one and the same Jesus.

Ver. 20. "*The Jews said, therefore: Forty-six years was this temple in building, and wilt thou raise it up in three days?*" The restoration of the temple by Herod had begun in the eighteenth year of his reign, according to Josephus (*Antiqq.* xv. 11, 1). In the *Jewish War*, the same historian, by an error, mentions the fifteenth. The first year of the reign of this prince was that from the first of Nisan 717 U. C. to the first of Nisan 718; the eighteenth would consequently be the year included between the first of Nisan 734 and the first of Nisan 735: it was about the autumn of that year that the work began (Jos. *Ant.* xv. 11, 1). The time indicated, forty-six full years (ᾠκοδομήθη), brings us, therefore, as far as to the autumn of the year 780. The present Passover, consequently, must be that of the year 781, and as it was divided from the year in which Jesus died by the one alluded to in vi. 4, it follows therefrom, that Jesus died in 783. Now for many other reasons, that year seems really to have been the year of His death. *Weiss* objects that the expression: *was built*, does not necessarily imply that it was still in the course of building at that moment. But the work continued still for many years, until in 64 it was finished under Agrippa II. What reason could there be to suppose an interruption at the time in which our narrative places us?

Ver. 21. "*But he spoke of the temple of his body.*" By ἐκεῖνος, *ille vero*, *he* opposed to every other, John strongly contrasts the thought of Jesus with the interpretation of the Jews and the want of understanding of the apostles. Only He comprehends perfectly the true sense of His own saying.

Ver. 22. "*When, therefore, he was risen from the dead, his disciples remembered that he had said this,*[1] *and they believed the Scripture and the word which Jesus had said.*" Into docile hearts the light came, although slowly. The event explained the word, as in its turn the word contributed to disclose the deep meaning of the event. It is surprising to meet here the limiting words τῇ γραφῇ, *the Scripture*; for the Scripture had not been quoted by Jesus, unless we think, with *Weiss*, of ver. 17, which is unnatural in view of the formal opposition established by ver. 22 between the time of the one and that of the other reminiscence. The evangelist undoubtedly wishes to intimate that the first point on which the light fell, in the hearts of the apostles, after the resurrection, was the prophecies of the Old Testament which announced that event (Ps. xvi.; Is. liii.; Hos. vi.; the prophet Jonah), and that it was by the intermediate agency of the interpreted prophecies that the present word of Jesus came back to their remembrance and was also made clear to them.

This little point which belongs to the inner biography of the apostles, stamps the narrative with the seal of historical reality. Let the reader

[1] T. R. wrongly adds αυτοις (*to them*), with K and some Mnn.

picture to himself, with *Baur*, a pseudo-John, in the second century, inventing this momentary want of intelligence in the disciples with regard to a saying which he had himself ascribed to Jesus! The moral impossibility of such a strange charlatanism as this is obvious. This remark applies to the similar points, iv. 32, 33; vii. 39; xi. 12; xii. 16, 33; xiii. 28, etc.

The Synoptics relate an act of Jesus similar to this; which they place at the beginning of the week of the Passion, either on Palm-day (Matt. xxi.; Luke xix.), or more exactly on the next day after that (Mark xi.). We might naturally enough suppose that these three evangelists, having omitted all the first year of Jesus' ministry, were led thereby to locate this event in the only visit to Jerusalem of which they relate the story. This is the opinion of *Lücke*, *de Wette*, *Ewald*, *Weiss*, etc. *Keim* goes much further; he claims that it would have been the grossest want of tact on Jesus' part thus at the start to advertise His Messiahship, and to break with the old Judaism as He does in John. But what gives to the corporeal act its meaning and its character is the words with which Jesus accompanies it. Now these words, which constitute the soul of the narrative, are very different in the Synoptics and in John, to such a degree that it would be impossible to unite them in one consecutive discourse. In the Synoptics, Jesus claims, on the ground of Is. lvi. 7 ("*My house shall be called a house of prayer for all peoples*"), the right of the Gentiles to the place which, from the beginning, had been conceded to them in the temple (1 Kings viii. 41–43). In John, there is no trace of this intention; Jesus has in view Israel itself and only Israel. This difference, as well as the characteristic reply, John ii. 19, argues two distinct events. If, as we may not doubt, the abuse which is in question really existed at the moment when Jesus presented Himself for the first time as Messiah, and as Son of God, it was impossible that He should tolerate it. It would have been to declare Himself Messiah and abdicate the Messianic office by one act. Thus John's narrative is self-justified. But it is, also, wholly true that if, after having been reduced during more than two years to the simple activity of a prophet, Jesus wished to reassume on Palm-Sunday His office as Messiah-King, and thus to take up again a connection with His beginnings, He could not do so better than by repeating that act by which He had entered upon His career, and by repressing again that abuse which had not been slow in reproducing itself. By the first expulsion He had invited the people to the reformation which could save them; by the second, He protested against the profane spirit which was about to destroy them. Thus the narrative of John and the Synoptic narrative equally justify themselves. This contrast between the two situations agrees with the difference between the words uttered. In John, seeing His appeal repelled, Jesus thinks of His death, the fatal limit of that first rejection; in the Synoptics, seeing the fall of Israel consummated, He proclaims the right of the Gentiles, who are soon going to be substituted for the Jews. As for *Keim's* objection, this author forgets that, by acting in this way, Jesus made an appeal precisely to that which was

deepest in the consciousness of every true member of the theocracy, respect for the temple. *Beyschlag* has justly called this proceeding on the part of Jesus, "the most profoundly conservative Jewish act." It was precisely the wonderful character of this act, that it inaugurated the revolution which was preparing, by connecting it with that which was most vital in the Israelitish past.

II.—*Jesus at Jerusalem:* ii. 23–iii. 21.

Jesus, not having been welcomed in the temple, does not force matters forward. The use of violence, even though by divine means, would have led Him to the career, not of a Christ, but of a Mahomet. In presence of the cold reserve which He meets, He retreats; and this retrograde movement characterizes, for a time, the course of His work. The palace has just shut its doors to Him; the capital remains open. Here He acts, yet no longer in the fullness of that Messianic sovereignty with which He had presented Himself in the temple. He confines Himself to teaching and miracles, the two prophetic agencies. Such is the admirable elasticity of the divine work in the midst of the world; it advances only as far as faith permits; in the face of resistance it yields; it retires even to its last entrenchment. Then, having reached this, it all at once resumes the offensive, and, engaging in the last struggle, succumbs externally, to conquer morally.

Vv. 23–25 are a preamble. It is the general picture of the activity of the Lord at Jerusalem, following after His undertaking in the temple. Then, in the following passage, iii. 1–21, John gives the remarkable example of the teaching of Jesus and of His Messianic testimony, in this earliest period, in presence of those whom He found disposed to faith.

Ver. 23. "*As he was in Jerusalem, at the Passover, at the feast, many believed on his name, seeing the miracles which he did.*"—The first clause of the verse contains three designations. One is that of *place: in Jerusalem*, at the centre of the theocracy, the normal theatre of His work. The second is that of *time: at the Passover*, in those days when the whole people were assembled in the capital, in greater numbers than on any other occasion in the year. The third designation is that of *the mode: at the feast*, in the midst of the solemn impressions which the daily ceremonies of that Paschal week awakened. The pronoun πολλοί, *many*, denotes nothing more than individuals; they form a contrast with the nation which should have collectively believed. Comp. the contrast between οἱ ἴδιοι, *His own*, and ὅσοι, *all those who*, i. 11, 12. But a still more sorrowful contrast is pointed out by the evangelist; it is that which existed between the faith of these believers and true faith. Their faith, to the view of Jesus, was not faith. No doubt, it had for its object His revelation as Christ and Son of God (*His name*); but it rested only upon the external fact of His miracles. The logical relation between this aorist *believed* and the present participle *seeing*, is expressed by the conjunction *because*. This faith had nothing inward and moral; it resulted solely from the impression of astonishment

produced upon them by these wonders. *Signs* may, indeed, strengthen and develop true faith, where it is already formed, by displaying to it fully the riches of its object (ii. 11). They may even, sometimes, excite attention; but not produce real faith. Faith is a moral act which attaches itself to the moral being in Jesus. The last words: *which He did*, depict, indeed, the nature of this faith; it was the material operation which impressed these persons. These miracles were, undoubtedly, numerous; allusion is made to them in iv. 45. John relates, however, only one of them; so far different is His aim from that of the Synoptics. He wishes only to describe here a spiritual situation.

Ver. 24, 25. "*But Jesus did not trust himself to them, because he knew all men,* 25, *and because he had no need that any one should testify of man; for he knew of himself what was in man.*" Jesus is no more dazzled by this apparent success, than He had been discouraged by the reverse which He had undergone in the temple. He discerns the insufficient nature of this faith. There is a sort of play upon words in the relation between οὐκ ἐπίστευεν, *He did not believe*, did not trust Himself, and ἐπίστευσαν, *they believed*, ver. 23. While they considering only the external facts, the miracles, *believed*, He (αὐτὸς δέ) not stopping with appearances, *did not believe;* He did not have *faith in their faith.* It is because He did not recognize in it the work of God. Consequently, He did not any more treat them as believers. How was this attitude of distrust manifested? It is difficult to state precisely. Probably the point in John's thought was rather a certain reserve of a moral nature, than positive external acts, such as reticence respecting His doctrine or the solitude in which He shut Himself up. *Luthardt*, "As they did not give themselves morally to Him, He did not give Himself morally to them." It is a profound observer initiated into the impressions of Jesus' mind,—this man who has laid hold of and set forth this delicate feature of His conduct. If he was himself one of the disciples whose call is related in chap. i., he must indeed have felt the difference between the conduct of Jesus towards these persons, and the manner in which He had deported Himself towards himself and his fellow-disciples. Let one picture to himself such a feature invented in the second century! Nothing in the text obliges us to identify this superior knowledge of Jesus with divine omniscience. The evangelist undoubtedly knew for himself that clear and penetrating look (ἐμβλέπειν) which read in the depth of the heart as in an open book. This superior knowledge of Jesus is the highest degree of the gift of the *discerning of spirits* (1 Cor. xii. 10; 1 John iv. 1).

The clause: *and because* . . . . etc., generalizes the statement of ver. 24. It signifies that, *in any case*, Jesus did not need to have recourse to information, in order to know what He had to think of such or such a man. This faculty of discernment was inherent in His person (*He Himself*) and, consequently, permanent (imperfect, *knew*). Ἵνα, *in order that*, is here no more than elsewhere the simple periphrasis for the infinitive (in opposition to *Weiss*). The idea of purpose, which remains always attached to this word, is explained by the tendency, which is inherent in the need of

knowledge, to satisfy itself. The article τοῦ before ἀνθρώπου, "*the* man," may be explained either in the generic sense: *man* in general, or, what is perhaps more correct, in an altogether individual sense: the man with whom He had to do in each given case (*Meyer*). But even in this last explanation, the generic sense can be applied to ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, *in the man*, in the following clause. The *for* would mean that He knew thus each representative of the type, *because* He knew thoroughly the type itself. However, it is more simple to give to this expression: *in the man*, the same individual sense as in the preceding clause, and to explain the *for* by the word: *Himself*. He had no need of information; for *of Himself* He knew . . .

On the foundation of this general situation, there is brought out separately, as a particular picture, the scene of the conversation with Nicodemus. Is this incident quoted as an *example* of that Jewish faith which is nothing but a form of unbelief ii. 23 (comp. ver. 2), as *Baur* thinks, or, on the contrary, as an *exception* to the attitude full of reserve which was assumed by Jesus and described vv. 24, 25 (*Ewald*)? The opinion of Baur strikes against the fact that Nicodemus later became a believer (chaps. vii. and xix.), so that the example would have been very badly chosen. On the other hand, the text gives no more indication that the following occurrence is related as a deviation from the line of conduct traced in ii. 24; and ver. 2 even makes Nicodemus belong in the class of persons described in vv. 23–25. *Lücke* sees in this narrative only an example of the supernatural knowledge of Jesus, but this idea does not correspond sufficiently with the very grave contents of the conversation. In *Reuss'* view, Nicodemus is a type, created by the evangelist, of that "literary and learned Judaism whose knowledge is nothing, and which has everything to learn from Jesus." But Nicodemus reappears twice afterwards, playing a part in the history of Jesus (chs. vii. and xix.); he was not, therefore, created only in order to give Jesus here the opportunity to convince him of ignorance. If the author inserted this incident in his narrative, it is because he saw in it the most memorable example of the *revelation* which Jesus had given, in the first period of His ministry, of His person and His work; comp. *Weiss* and *Keil*.

The part of this conversation in our Gospel may be compared with that of the Sermon on the Mount in the Gospel of Matthew: these two passages have an inauguratory character. As for Nicodemus, he is at once an example and an exception: an example, since miracles were the occasion of his faith; an exception, since the manner in which Jesus treats him proves that He hopes for the happy development of this faith. The faith characterized vv. 23–25, as *Luthardt* observes, is not real faith; but none the more is it unbelief. From this point there may be falling back or advance.—How did the evangelist get the knowledge of this conversation? May Jesus or Nicodemus have related it to him? The first alternative (*Meyer*) has somewhat of improbability. In the second, it is asked whether Nicodemus understood well enough to retain it so thoroughly. Why could not John himself have been present at the interview, even though it took place at night? Comp. ver. 11.

But this question is subordinate to another. Is not this conversation itself, as we have it before us, a free composition of the author in which he has united different elements of the ordinary teaching of his master, or even, as *Keim* says, put into His mouth a highly spiritual summary of his own semi-Gnostic dogmatics? Finally, without going so far, can it not be supposed, at least, that the subjectivity of the author has, without his having a suspicion of it himself, influenced this account more or less, especially towards the end of the conversation? This is what we shall have to examine. For this purpose, what shall be our touch-stone? If the direct, natural application of the words of Jesus to Nicodemus *the Pharisee* is sustained even to the end, we shall recognize by this sign the authenticity of the account. If, on the contrary, the discourse loses itself, as it advances, in vague generalities, without appropriateness and without direct relation to the given situation, we shall find in this fact the indication of a more or less artificial composition.

Ver. 1. "*There was a man of the Pharisees, whose name was Nicodemus, one of the rulers of the Jews.*" The name Nicodemus, though of Greek origin, was not unusual among the Jews. The Talmud mentions several times a person of this name (*Nakedimon*), called also *Bounai*, reckoned in the number of Jesus' disciples. He was one of the four richest inhabitants of the capital. His family fell into the greatest destitution. He must have been alive also at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem. This last circumstance, connected with the great age of Nicodemus at the time of Jesus' ministry, renders the identity of the latter with the personage of whom the Talmud speaks, doubtful. *Stier* saw in the word ἀνθρωπος, *a man*, an allusion to ii. 25; John would remind us thereby that Nicodemus was an example of that human type which Jesus knew so well; this is far-fetched. Before naming him, John points out his quality as *Pharisee*. This characteristic signifies much more, indeed, than his name, for the understanding of the following conversation. The most narrow and exalted national particularism had created for itself an organ in the Pharisaic party. According to the ideas of that sect, every Jew possessing the legal virtues and qualities had a right of entrance into the Messianic kingdom. *Universo Israeli est portio in mundo futuro*, said the Rabbis. The Messiah Himself was only the perfect and all-powerful Jew, who, raised by His miracles to the summit of glory, was to destroy the Gentile power and place Israel at the head of humanity. This Messianic programme, which the imagination of the Pharisaic doctors had drawn out of the prophecies, was that which brought with it Nicodemus to the presence of Jesus. The title ἀρχων, *ruler*, denotes, undoubtedly, one of the lay members of the Sanhedrim (vii. 50), in contrast to the ἀρχιερεῖς, *chief priests* (vii. 50; Luke xxiii. 13).

Ver. 2. "*He came to him*[1] *by night and said: Master, we know that thou art a teacher come from God; for no one can do these miracles which thou doest,*

[1] 6 Byz. Syr^{sch}. read προς τον Ιησουν instead of προς αυτον (a correction with a view to public reading).

except God be with him."—What was the purpose of this visit? These first words of Nicodemus are only a preamble; it would be idle to seek here the revelation of the purpose of his procedure. *Koppe* has supposed that he came to act as a spy on the Lord. But Jesus treats him as an honest person, and Nicodemus shows himself sincere during the course of the conversation, and also afterwards. *Meyer* has supposed that he came to inquire about the way to be saved. But as a good Jew and pious Pharisee, he by no means doubted as to his own salvation. We must, rather, suppose that he had discerned in Jesus an extraordinary being, and as he must have known the answer of the forerunner to the deputation of the Sanhedrim, he asked himself seriously whether Jesus might not be the Messiah announced by John as already present. In that case he would try to sound His plans respecting the decisive revolution which His coming was to involve. This supposition appears to me more natural than that of *Weiss*, who, because of the title of *teacher* with which Nicodemus salutes Jesus, thinks that he wished to question Him concerning what new teaching He had just given. But Nicodemus evidently could not salute Jesus by any other title than that of *teacher*, even if, as he must have had from the testimony of John the Baptist and in consequence of the expulsion of the traders, he had a presentiment that there was in Him something still greater. The plural *οἴδαμεν*, *we know*, proves that He did not take this step solely in his own name, but that a certain number of his colleagues entertained the same thoughts with himself.—He comes *by night*. This circumstance, noticed expressly in xix. 39 and perhaps also in vii. 50, is easily explained by the fear which he had of compromising himself before the other members of the Sanhedrim, and even before the people. Perhaps, also, he wished to avoid further increasing, through a step taken in broad daylight, the reputation of the young teacher. Nicodemus gives Him the title of *ῥαββί*, *Master;* this is saying very much on his part; since Jesus had not passed through the different degrees of rabbinical studies which gave a right to this title. Comp. vii. 15: "*The Jews were astonished, saying: How does this man know the Scriptures, not being a man who has studied?*" It is precisely this extraordinary course of the development of Jesus which Nicodemus characterizes by saying: *a teacher come from God.* *Ἀπὸ θεοῦ*, *from God*, is placed at the beginning as the principal idea, opposed to that of a regular doctorate. The same contrast is found in vii. 16 in the mouth of Jesus Himself. This designation: *from God*, depends neither on the verb, *come*, nor on the word *teacher*, separately, but on the complex phrase; the sense is: "come as a teacher from God." The argument is consonant with theocratic precedents (Exod. iv.). Miracles prove divine assistance, and this proves the divine mission. But this formal demonstration, intended to prove to Jesus a truth which he does not doubt, is somewhat pedantic and must have shocked the ear of Him to whom it was addressed. So Jesus cuts short the discourse thus commenced by a sudden apostrophe, intended rather to answer the inmost thoughts of His interlocutor than his spoken words.

Ver. 3. "*Jesus answered and said unto him: Verily, verily, I say unto you,*

Except a man be born anew, he cannot see the kingdom of God."—The relation of this answer to the words of Nicodemus has been differently understood, for the very reason that He was not able to finish the expression of His thought. *Meyer*, in conformity with his supposition indicated above, interprets this answer thus: "Every particular work is unfitted to open the door of the kingdom of God; there must be a radical regeneration." But we have seen that Nicodemus, the Pharisee, could not have come with the thought which Meyer supposes. *Baumgarten-Crusius* and *Weiss*, starting from the title of *teacher* which he had given Him, think that Jesus means to say: "It is not a new teaching only that you need, it is a new birth." According to our previous remarks, we think, rather, with *Luthardt*, that, on hearing the first words of Nicodemus, the whole Pharisaic programme with relation to the kingdom of God presented itself vividly to the mind of Jesus, and that He felt the need of directly opposing to it the true divine plan touching this capital subject. Nicodemus believes that he discerns in the appearance of Jesus the dawn of the Messianic kingdom, such as he conceived it; Jesus reveals to him an altogether spiritual conception of that kingdom, and, consequently, of all other moral conditions for entrance into it: "It is not a glorified earthly life; it is not a matter of expelling the Roman legions and of going to conquer the Capitol! The true kingdom of God is a state of the soul, the submission of the heart to the Divine will; to enter it, there must be wrought within the man a work at once spiritual and individual, which has nothing in common with the great political drama which thou hast in view." It is, then, the full security in which Nicodemus is living with regard to his participation in the kingdom of the Messiah, that Jesus wishes to break up, by answering him in this way. We have in Luke xvii. 20, 21, a parallel which offers the best commentary on our passage. "*When cometh the kingdom of God?*" a group of Pharisees ask of Jesus. "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation," Jesus answers; "it is within you." The coincidence could not be more complete. The formula *amen, amen*, implies a doubt in the hearer's mind (see i. 52); the doubt implied here is that which naturally arises from the Pharisaic prejudices of Nicodemus. "The pious Jew, the honored Pharisee, the powerful ruler, Nicodemus is prostrated," says *Hengstenberg*, "at the shock of this, *verily*." The solemn expression: "*I say unto thee*," or "I declare to thee," recalls to Nicodemus that dignity of divine teacher which he has himself just attributed to Jesus. By the indeterminate formula: *if any one*, Jesus avoids the harshness which the direct application to such an old man would have involved. The word ἄνωθεν has, in the three other passages where John uses it (ver. 31; xix. 11, 23) the local meaning: *from above*, that is to say, *from heaven*. The passages, also, may be compared in which he makes use of the expression: *to be born of God;* for example, i. 13, and in the 1st Epistle ii. 29, iii. 9, etc.; nine times in all. These parallel passages seem decisive and have determined a large number of interpreters (*Origen, Erasmus, Lücke, de Wette, Meyer, Bäumlein, Reuss*, etc.) to adopt this meaning here. But may we not also conclude from the

last passages cited that if this were the idea which John wished to express, he would rather have employed the expression ἐκ θεοῦ, *of God?* The misunderstanding of Nicodemus (ver. 4) is more easily explained, if Jesus said in Aramaic: *anew*, than *from above*, since even in this latter case, also, Nicodemus might have spoken of a *second* birth. At all events, it follows from the expressions: *a second time* (δεύτερον) and *his mother's womb*, that, if he thought of a birth coming *from above*, he understood this term in the sense in which it can be applied even to the natural birth,—that is to say, that every child who is born comes from God, descends from heaven. However, if the word ἄνωθεν expressed here such a striking idea, the emphasis would be laid upon this word, and, in that case, it ought to be placed before the verb. Placed after the verb, ἄνωθεν only *strengthens* the idea of beginning connected with that of being born, which leads us to give to this adverb the temporal, rather than the local sense: *from the beginning*. We have three striking examples of this sense of ἄνωθεν. Josephus says (*Antiqq.* i. 18, 3): φιλίαν ἄνωθεν ποιεῖται; he contracts friendship with him, *going back to the beginning*, that is, as if they entered for the first time into mutual relations. *Tholuck* cites, the following passage of Artemidorus (*Oneirocriticon* i. 14): A father dreaming that his wife gives birth to a child exactly like himself, says: "that he seems to himself ἄνωθεν γεννᾶσθαι, to be born from the beginning, to recommence his own existence." In the *Acta Pauli*, Jesus says to Peter, who is flying from martyrdom and to whom He presents Himself: ἄνωθεν μέλλω σταυρωθῆναι, "I am going to begin anew my crucifixion." Compare also in the New Testament, Luke i. 3; Acts xxvi. 5; and Gal. iv. 9. In this last passage ἄνωθεν is completed by πάλιν: "entering from the beginning into a state of slavery which will be the second." This sense of ἄνωθεν can scarcely be given in French. The expression *tout à neuf* would best answer to it. The sense is: to place in the course of the earthly life a beginning as new as birth itself. There is nothing to oppose this sense, philologically, according to the examples cited. And it makes the answer of Nicodemus more easily understood. The word *to see* is perhaps connected with *to be born;* a new sight implies a new life. Sight is often the symbol of enjoyment, as well as of suffering (viii. 51). In the old covenant, the *kingdom* of God was realized in a politico-religious form. From this temporary envelopment, Jesus freed the spiritual principle which forms the true foundation of that state of things, the submission of the human will to the divine will, in one word, holiness (comp. the Sermon on the Mount); and from this principle He derives a new order of things which is first realized in individuals, and which brings about thereby the renewal of society, and finally is to transform nature itself. For it is false to exclude, as *Reuss* does (*Hist. de la théol. chrét.* t. II., pp. 555 f.), the social and final consequences of the notion of the kingdom of God in the sense of our Gospel. The eschatological hopes attached to this term in the Old and New Testaments are found again in full in v. 28, 29; vi. 39, 40, 44, 54. *Meyer* calls attention to the fact that the term *kingdom of God* does not again appear anywhere else in John, and rightly finds in this fact a proof of the truly

historical character of the narrative which occupies our attention. If, as *Renan* thinks, Jesus had been only a young enthusiast, obedient to a mission which He had assumed for Himself, would He not have been flattered by seeing such considerable personages as Nicodemus and those whom he represented (ver. 1) as well as the colleagues in whose name he spoke, ranked among the number of his adherents, and would not this feeling have borne Him on, at this moment, to entirely different language? The assured feeling of the divinity and holiness of His missson alone could, in the face of this success, keep Him from a false step.

Ver. 4. "*Nicodemus says to him: How can a man be born when he is old? He cannot enter a second time, can he, into his mother's womb and be born?*" This saying, to the view of several modern critics, is a master-piece of improbability. *Reuss* thinks that "it is indeed, wrong to try to give to this answer a meaning even in the smallest degree plausible or defensible." *Schleiermacher* proposes to explain thus: "It is impossible, at my age, to recommence a new *moral* life." *Tholuck*, *Bäumlein* and *Hengstenberg*, nearly the same: "What thou askest of me is as impossible as that a man should enter again. . . ." These explanations evidently weaken the meaning of the text. *Meyer* thinks that the embarrassment into which the saying of Jesus throws Nicodemus, leads him to say something absurd. *Lange* finds rather a certain irritation in this answer: The Pharisee would attempt to engage in a rabbinical discussion in order to show Jesus the exaggeration of His demands. These suppositions have little probability. Would Jesus speak as He does in the sequel to a man so narrow-minded or so irritable? *Lücke* explains: "Thou canst not, by any means, mean that . . .?" This explanation is philologically accurate; it faithfully renders the meaning of the negative μή (comp. our translation). As *Weiss* observes, Nicodemus does not answer thus as a man wanting in understanding; but he is offended at seeing Jesus propose to him such a condition; he refuses to enter into His thought, and, holding firmly to the literal sense, he limits himself to a setting forth of its absurdity. The manner in which he expresses this impression does not seem even to be entirely free from irony. It is because in truth, he cannot conceive how the beginning of another life can be placed in the womb of the natural existence. The kingdom of God has always appeared to him as the most glorious form of the earthly existence itself. To what purpose a new birth, in order to enter into it? The Old Testament spoke, no doubt, of the force from above, of the divine aid necessary to sanctify the man, but not of a new birth (see *Luthardt*).

The words: "*when he is old*," prove that Nicodemus did not fail to apply to himself the: "*If any one*" of Jesus. The word δεύτερον, *a second time*, undoubtedly reproduces only partially the meaning of ἄνωθεν, *from the beginning*, in the mouth of Jesus. This is because Nicodemus does not comprehend the difference between a beginning anew and a *different* beginning. A radical moral renewal seems to him impossible without a simultaneous physical renewal. Thus the explanation which Jesus gives him bears on the absolute *difference* between the natural birth and the new birth which He demands:

Ver. 5. "*Jesus answered: Verily, verily, I say unto thee that except a man is born of water and of spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.*"[1] The words, *of water and spirit*, substituted for ἄνωθεν (*from the beginning*) indicate to Nicodemus the new factors, and consequently the totally different nature of this second birth. The first term: *of water*, agrees better with the idea of a *new* birth, than with that of a *heavenly* birth. Spiritualism, embarrassed by the material character of this first means, has often sought to unite it with the second. Thus *Calvin* paraphrases the expression *of water and spirit* by the term *aquae spiritales;* he finds support in the expression *baptism of the Spirit and of fire* (Luke iii. 16). But the spiritual sense of the word *fire* could not be questioned in that phrase. It was otherwise with the word *water* in the saying with which we are occupied, especially at the time when Jesus was speaking thus. The baptism of John was producing at that time an immense sensation in Israel, so that the thought of Nicodemus, on hearing the words, *birth by water*, must have turned immediately to that ceremony; as it was celebrated in the form of a total or partial immersion, it quite naturally represented a birth. Jesus, moreover, at the moment when He thus expressed Himself, was in a sense coming out from the water of baptism; it was when completing this rite that He had Himself received the Holy Spirit. How, in such circumstances, could this expression: *Born of water*, have possibly designated on His lips anything else than baptism? Thus, also, is explained the negative and almost menacing form: *Except a man* . . . Nicodemus was a Pharisee, and we know that the Pharisees had refused to submit to John's baptism (Luke vii. 30); this saying contained, therefore, a very real admonition addressed to Nicodemus. *Weiss*, laying stress upon the absence of the article before the word *water*, rejects this special allusion to the rite of baptism. He sees in the water only an image of the purification of sin effected by the new spiritual birth. But the absence of the article simply makes prominent the *quality* of the means, and does not prevent us from thinking of the special practical use which was made of it by John at that time. Nicodemus must learn that the acceptance of the work of the forerunner was the first condition of entering into the new life. This first term, therefore, contained a positive invitation to break with the line of conduct adopted by the Pharisaic party towards John the Baptist. But what is the relation between baptism and the new birth (ver. 3)? *Lücke* makes prominent in baptism the subjective element of repentance (μετάνοια). He thinks that Jesus meant to say: First of all, on the part of man, repentance (of which baptism is the emblem); afterwards, on the part of God, the Spirit. But the two defining words are parallel, depending on one and the same preposition; the one cannot represent something purely subjective and the other something purely objective. The water also contains something objective, divine; this divine element in baptism is expressed in the best way by *Strauss*. "If baptism is, on the part of man," he says, "the declara-

[1] ℵ reads ιδειν την βασιλειαν των ουρανων (*the kingdom of heaven*), a reading which Tischendorf adopts (8th edition).

tion of the *renunciation* of sin, it is, on the part of God, the *declaration of the pardon* of sins." The baptism of water, in so far as offered and administered on the part of God and in His name, contains the promise of pardon, of which it is the visible pledge, in favor of the sinner who accepts it. In this sense, Peter says on the day of Pentecost, Acts ii. 38: "Be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ *for the pardon of sins;* and [following upon this pardon] you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." And it must, indeed, be noticed that he says: "The pardon of *sins*," and not of *his sins*. For it is the idea of baptism *in itself*, and not that of its individual efficacy, which Peter wishes to indicate. Baptism is, indeed, the crowning-point of the symbolic lustrations of the Old Testament; comp. Ps. li., 4, 9, "*Wash me from mine iniquity . . . Cleanse me from my sin with hyssop; wash me and I shall be whiter than snow.*" Ezek. xxxvi. 25, "*I will sprinkle upon you clean water, and you shall be clean.*" Zech. xiii. 1, "*In that day there shall be a fountain opened to the house of David and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem for sin and for uncleanness.*" Water is, in all these passages, the emblem of the expiatory blood, the only real means of pardon. Comp. 1 John v. 6, where *the water, the blood* and *the Spirit* are placed in connection with one another; the water, on the one hand, as the symbol of the blood which reconciles and, on the other, as the pledge of the Spirit which regenerates. To accept the baptism of water administered by John was, therefore, while bearing witness of one's repentance, to place oneself under the benefit of the promise of the Messianic pardon. The condemnation being thus taken away, the baptized person found himself restored before God to his normal position, that of a man who had not sinned; and consequently he found himself fitted to receive from the Messiah Himself the gift of the Spirit. The *Spirit:* Here is the active, efficient principle of the new birth, of the renewal of the will and of the dispositions of the heart, and thereby even of the whole work of sanctification. Jesus sums up, therefore, in these two words: *Of water and spirit*, the essential principles of the Christian salvation, pardon and sanctification, those two conditions of entrance into the divine kingdom.

In the following verses, no further mention of water is made, precisely because it has in the new birth only a negative value; it removes the obstacle, the condemnation. The creative force proceeds from the Spirit. The absence of the article with the word *spirit*, is explained in the same way as with the word *water*. The question is of the *nature* or *quality* of the factors co-operating in this supernatural birth. The expression, εἰσελθεῖν (*to enter*), is substituted here for the term ἰδεῖν (*to see*), of ver. 3. The figure of *entering into*, is in more direct correspondence with that of *being born*. It is by *coming forth from* (ἐκ) the two elements indicated, in which the soul is plunged, that it *enters into* (εἰς), the kingdom. The reading of the Sinaitic MS.: "the kingdom *of heaven*," is found also, according to Hippolytus, among the Docetæ of the second century; it is found in a recently discovered fragment of *Irenæus*, in the *Apostolical Constitutions*, and in *Origen* (transl.). These authorities are undoubtedly not sufficient to authorize us to substitute it for the received reading, as *Tischen-*

dorf does. But this variant must be extremely ancient. At all events, it overthrows the objection raised against the reality of the quotation of our passage in Justin, *Apol.* i. 61. (See *Introd.*, p. 152, 153.)

In speaking thus to Nicodemus, Jesus did not think of making salvation depend, either in general or in each particular case, on the material act of baptism. The example of the thief on the cross proves that pardon could be granted without the baptism of water. But, when the offer of this sign has been made and the sinner has rejected it, the position is different; and this was the case with Nicodemus. By the two following sentences, Jesus demonstrates the *necessity* (ver. 6a), and the *possibility* (ver. 6b), of the new birth, by leaving aside the water, to keep closely to the Spirit only.

Ver. 6. "*That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.*" The logical transition from ver. 5 to ver. 6 is this understood idea: "The Kingdom of God can only be of a spiritual nature, as God is Himself." In order to enter it, therefore, there must be, not *flesh*, as every man is by his first birth, but *spirit*, as he becomes by the new birth. The word *flesh* (see pp. 268–269), taken in itself, does not necessarily imply the notion of sin. But it certainly cannot be maintained, with *Weiss*, that the question here is simply of the *insufficiency* of the natural birth, even in the state of innocence, to render man fit for the divine kingdom. Nevertheless, we must not forget that the question here is of humanity in its present constitution, according to which sin is connected with the fact of birth more closely than with any other of the natural life (Ps. li. 7).[1] The expression: *the flesh*, seems to me, therefore, to denote here humanity in its present state, in which the flesh rules the spirit. This state is transmitted from generation to generation in such a way that, without renewal, no man can come out of that fatal circle. And hence the *necessity* of regeneration. How does this transmission of the carnal state accord with individual culpability? The last words of this conversation will throw some light on this difficult question. According to this saying, it is impossible to suppose that Jesus regarded Himself as born in the same way as other men (ver. 7, *you*). The substantive *flesh*, as a predicate (*is flesh*), has a much more forcible meaning than that of the adjective (*carnal*) would be. The state has, in some sort, become nature. Hence, it follows that it is not enough to cleanse or adorn outwardly the natural man; a new nature must be substituted for the old, by means of a regenerating power. We might also see in the second clause a proof of the *necessity* of the new birth; it would be necessary, in that case, to give it the exclusive sense: "*Nothing except* what is born of the Spirit is spir-

[1] The opposition which *Weiss* makes to appear between Paul and John as to the use of the word *flesh*, as if the notion of sin were connected more closely to this term by the first than by the second, is only relatively well-founded. This is what the difference amounts to: in Paul, of eighty-eight cases in which the word *flesh* is used, there are thirty-two where the term has a morally indifferent sense; in John (Gospel and Epistle), there is, beyond our present passage, only one case among fifteen (1 John ii. 16), where the notion of sin seems to be attached to the word *flesh*.

itual (and can enjoy, in consequence, the Kingdom of the Spirit)." But the clause has rather a positive and affirmative sense: "That which is born of the Spirit is really spirit, and consequently cannot fail to enjoy the Kingdom of the Spirit." The idea, therefore, is that of the *reality* of the new birth, and consequently, of its *complete possibility*. This is the answer to the question: "How *can* a man?" Let the Spirit breathe, and the spiritual man exists! The word *Spirit*, as subject, denotes the Divine Spirit, and, as predicate, the new man. Here, again, the substantive (*spirit*), is used instead of the adjective (*spiritual*), to characterize the new essence. This word *spirit*, in the context here, includes not only the new principle of spiritual life, but also the soul and body, in subjection to the Spirit. The neuter, τὸ γεγεννημένον (*that which is born*), is substituted in the two clauses for the masculine (*he who is born*), for the purpose of designating the *nature* of the product, abstractedly from the individual; thus, the generality of the law is more clearly brought out. *Hilgenfeld* finds here the Gnostic distinction between two kinds of men, originally opposite. *Meyer* well replies: "There is a distinction, not between two classes of men, but between two different phases in the life of the same individual."

Jesus observes, that the astonishment of Nicodemus, instead of diminishing, goes on increasing. He penetrates the cause of this fact: Nicodemus has not yet given a place in his conception of divine things to the action of the Holy Spirit; this is the reason why he is always seeking to represent to himself the new birth as a fact apprehensible by the senses. Recognizing him, however, as a serious and sincere man, He wishes to remove from his path this stumbling-stone. Here is not a fact, He says to him, which one can picture to himself; it can be comprehended only as far as it is experienced.

Vv. 7, 8. "*Marvel not at that which I have said unto thee: ye must be born anew. The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but knowest not whence it cometh nor*[1] *whither it goeth. So is every one that is born of the Spirit.*[2]—By the expression: "*Ye* must *be born*," Jesus exempts Himself from this general condition. It was necessary for Him to *grow spiritually*, no doubt, (Luke ii. 40, 52); but He did not need to be born again. The gift of the Holy Spirit at His baptism was not a regeneration, but the crowning of a perfectly normal previous development under the constant influence of the Spirit.—Jesus directs the attention of Nicodemus to a fact which, like the new birth, escapes the observation of the senses, and which is proved only by its effects, the blowing of the wind.—The Greek word πνεῦμα has, as well as the Hebrew word רוּח, the twofold meaning of *wind* and *spirit*. As it appears from the following *so* that there is a comparison, this term is certainly taken here in the sense of *wind*. Tholuck (first edition) supposed that, at that very moment, the wind was heard blowing in the streets of Jerusalem. This supposition gives more of reality to the words: *and thou hearest the sound thereof*.—When he says: *thou*

[1] The Mjj. Mnn. and Vss. read και που, and not η που (A. It. Vg.)

[2] ℵ alone reads εκ του υδατος και του πνευματος.

knowest not . . . Jesus does not speak of the explanation of the wind in general. He calls to mind only that, in each particular case, it is impossible to determine exactly the point where this breath is formed and the one where it ends. Perhaps there is an allusion to Eccles. xi. 5: "As thou knowest not the way of the wind . . ." While the development of all natural life connects itself with an organic visible germ and ends in a product which falls under the senses, the wind appears and subsides as if a free irruption of the infinite into the finite. There is, therefore, in nature no more striking example of the action of the Spirit. The operation of the regenerating principle is not bound to any rule appreciable by the senses; it is perceived only by its action on the human soul. But the man in whom this action works does not understand either from whence these new impressions which he feels proceed, nor whither they lead him. He is only conscious of a profound work which is wrought within him and which radically renews him. The adverb of rest *ποῦ*, with the verb of motion *ὑπάγει*, is a frequent construction in Greek. It is, as it were, the anticipation of the state of rest which will follow the motion when it has reached its end. The application of the comparison, in the second part of the verse, is not expressed altogether correctly. It would have been necessary to say: so it takes place *in every man* who is born . . . But it is not in the genius of the Greek language to make a comparison and its application correspond symmetrically; comp., in the New Testament, Matt. xiii. 19 f., xxv. 1, etc.—The perfect participle *γεγεννημένος* denotes the completed fact: The eye has seen nothing, the ear has heard nothing. And yet there is a man born anew and one who has entered into the eternal kingdom? All is done, and nothing has been visible! What a contrast with the noisy and pompous appearance of the divine kingdom according to the Pharisaic programme!

Vv. 9, 10. "*Nicodemus answered and said unto him: How can these things be?* 10. *Jesus answered and said unto him: Thou art the teacher of Israel, and thou knowest not these things!*"—Nicodemus does not deny; but he acknowledges himself a stranger to all experience of the action of the Spirit. It is Jesus' turn to be astonished. He discovers with surprise such spiritual ignorance in one who, at this moment, represents before Him the teaching of the old covenant. Something of bitterness has been found in this reply; it expresses nothing but legitimate astonishment. Ought not such passages as Jer. xxxi. 33; Ezek. xxxvi. 26–28; Ps. cxliii. 10, 11, to have prepared Nicodemus to understand the power of the divine breath? But the Pharisees set their hearts only on the *glory* of the kingdom, rather than on its *holiness*.—The article *ὁ* before *διδάσκαλος*, "*the* teacher" has been interpreted in the sense: "the well-known, illustrious teacher" (*Winer, Keil.*) The irony would, thus, be very strong. This article, rather, designates Nicodemus as the representative of the Israelitish teaching office, as the official *διδασκαλία* personified. Comp. the *ὁ ἐσθίων* Mk. xiv. 18.

The tenth verse forms the transition to the second part of the conversation. That which externally marks this part is the silence of Nicodemus.

As *Hengstenberg* observes, he seems to say, like Job before Jehovah: "*I am too small; what shall I answer? I have spoken once; but I put my hand upon my mouth.*" On His part, Jesus treats him with a touching kindness and condescension; He has found him humble and docile, and He now opens Himself to him without reserve. Nicodemus came, as we have seen, to interrogate Him respecting His Messianic mission and the mode of the establishment of the divine kingdom so long expected. He did not by any means preoccupy his thoughts with the moral conditions on which he might himself enter into that state of things. A faithful Jew, a pious Pharisee, a holy Sanhedrist, he believed himself saved by the very fact that he was such. Jesus, as a consummate educator, began by reminding him of what he forgot,—the practical question. He taught him that which he did not ask for, but that which it was more important for him to know. And now He reveals to him kindly all that which he desired to know: He declares to him what He *is* (vv. 11–13); what He comes to *do* (vv. 14–17); and what will *result* for humanity from His coming (vv. 18–21).

The first part of the conversation is summed up thus: What will take place? Answer: Nothing, in the sense in which you understand it. The second means: And yet something really takes place, and even a thing most unheard of: The supreme revelator is present; redemption is about to be accomplished; the universal judgment is preparing. Such are the divine facts which are displayed before the eyes of Nicodemus in the second part of the conversation. The conduct of Jesus with this man is thus in complete contrast with that which had been mentioned in ii. 24. He *trusts Himself to him;* for He has recognized his perfect uprightness; comp. ver. 21.

The positive teaching does not, properly, begin until ver. 13. Vv. 11, 12, are prefatory to it.

This passage vv. 11–13 is clearly joined to ver. 2; Nicodemus had spoken in the name of several: "*We know . . .*" (ver. 1); Jesus addresses himself to these absent interlocutors: "*You* receive not . . . ; if I told *you* . . . " (v. 11b and 12a). Nicodemus had called Jesus a teacher "*come from God*" (ver. 1). Jesus shows him that he has spoken more truly than he thought; He reveals Himself to him as the Son of man, descended from heaven to bear witness of heavenly things (ver. 13). This relation between ver. 1 and vv. 11–13 proves that the whole of the beginning of the conversation, vv. 3–10, was called forth accidentally, and is in reality but an episode; and that now only do the revelations, which Nicodemus had come to seek, properly speaking, begin.

Vv. 11–13. In opposition to the doctorate of the letter, devoid of all spiritual intuition, Jesus announces to him the coming of a teaching, which will rest on the immediate knowledge of the truth (ver. 11). In order that Nicodemus may profit by this higher teaching, Jesus invites him to faith (ver. 12). Finally He displays to him, in His own person, the perfect revealer (ver. 13). *Weiss* and *Keil* think that Jesus wishes now to point out the way to attain regeneration, and, consequently, also to understand it. But the setting forth of salvation given in the sequel is far too consid-

erable for it possibly to be caused by so special a relation to that which precedes.

Ver. 11. "*Verily, verily, I say unto thee, We speak that we do know and bear testimony of that we have seen; and ye receive not our testimony.*" The formula *amen, amen* ("*in truth*"), declares, as always, a truth which Jesus is about to draw from the depths of His consciousness, and which, presenting itself as a revelation to the mind of His interlocutor, must triumph over his prejudices or his doubts. The rabbinical teaching worked upon the letter of the Scriptures, but did not place itself in contact with the essential truth which it contained (v. 39). Jesus proclaims with an inward satisfaction the coming of a wholly different teaching of holy things, which will have the character of certainty: "*that which we know;*" because it will spring from immediate intuition: "*that which we have seen.*" The two subordinate verbs, *we speak*, and *we testify*, are in correspondence with the two principal verbs: one *speaks* (declares) that which one *knows;* one *testifies* of what one *has seen.* There is, moreover, evident progress between each verb and the corresponding verb of the following clause: *Knowledge* rises to the clearness of *sight*, and *speaking* assumes the solemn character of *testimony.* The contrast marked here by Jesus between the rabbinical teaching and His own struck even the people; comp. Matt. vii. 28, 29.

But of whom, then, does Jesus speak when He says "*We*"? What is this college of new teachers whom He contrasts with the caste of the scribes and sages of this age which passes away (1 Cor. i. 20)? These plurals "*we speak . . . we testify*" have been explained in a variety of ways. *Beza* and *Tholuck* understand by *we:* "I and the prophets." *Bengel:* "I and the Holy Spirit." *Chrysostom* and *Euthymius:* "I and God." The impossibility of these explanations is manifest. *De Wette* and *Lücke* see in this *we* a plural of majesty; *Meyer* and *Keil*, the plural of category: "teachers such as I." These explanations are less untenable. But this first person of the plural, used for the designation of Himself, is unexampled in the mouth of Jesus. And why return afterwards to the singular (vv. 12, 13): "*I* tell thee . . . if *I* have told you . . . if *I* tell you." Just as the *you* is addressed to other persons besides Nicodemus (comp. ver. 2: *we know*), so the *we* must be applied not only to Jesus, but to a plurality of individuals which He opposes to that of which Nicodemus is the representative. We must, therefore, suppose that Jesus here announces to Nicodemus the existence of a certain number of men who already represent the new mode of teaching. According to *Knapp, Hofmann, Luthardt, Weiss*, etc., Jesus, when speaking thus, thinks only of Himself and *John the Baptist.* He alludes to that which John and He beheld in the scene of the baptism. But the idea of regeneration to which it is claimed that this *seeing* and *knowing* refer is totally foreign to the scene of the baptism, and even in our chapter, vv. 31, 32, the forerunner expressly places himself outside of the limits of the new teaching inaugurated by Jesus. We believe, therefore, with *Lange, Hengstenberg* and *Westcott*, that Jesus is thinking of Himself and *His disciples*, of whom one

or several were at that moment with Him; and who were beginning already to become the organs of this new teaching-office inaugurated by Him. In the person of Jesus, then, through His acts and His words, heaven is constantly opened before their eyes (i. 52); already they truly *see* and *know;* their gaze pierces to the essence of things: "*He who hath seen me, hath seen the Father.*" On this foundation, they already testify. What vivacity, what freshness, in the declaration of John and Andrew, i. 42, in that of Philip, i. 47, in the exclamation of Nathanael, i. 50, in the profession of Peter, vi. 68, 69! There are here, no doubt in a weak measure, sight and testimony. Jesus feels Himself no more alone. Hence the feeling of profound joy which breathes in these plurals: *we speak, we know,* etc., and which betrays itself even in the form of His language. Indeed, *Luthardt* has observed, with reason, that we see appearing here that form of parallelism which constitutes the poetic rhythm of the Hebrew language. This feature of style betrays emotion and always marks a moment of peculiar exaltation (v. 37; vi. 35, 55, 56; xii. 44, 45). The language resembles chant. Nicodemus must learn that things are more advanced than he thinks! This passage recalls the one in the Synoptics where Jesus declares the preference which God gives to *little children,* to His humble and ignorant disciples, over the intelligent and learned rabbis of Jerusalem (Matt. xi. 25; Luke xi. 21). While his colleagues and himself are still waiting for the solemn hour of the advent of the kingdom, that kingdom is already present without their knowledge, and others participate in it before them! *Meyer, Astié* and others refer the expression "*we have seen*" to the knowledge possessed by Christ in His pre-existent state. But *Weiss* himself rejects here this explanation which he thinks himself obliged to adopt in other analogous cases (see on ver. 13). It would be altogether incompatible with the interpretation which we have given to the word *we.*

Before unfolding to Nicodemus what He knows and what He sees of the things above, Jesus sadly reverts to the manner in which His testimony has been received by the leaders of the theocracy: "*And ye receive not our testimony.*" Καί, *and,* has the meaning here of *and yet* (i. 10). This copula brings out better than would the particle καίτοι, *yet* (which John never uses), the contradiction between two facts which should be exclusive of each other and which nevertheless move on together (hearing and rejecting the testimony). Jesus was conscious, as every living preacher is, of the inward resistance which His appearance and His teaching met in the hearts of the people and their rulers. A presentiment of this might have been had already at the time of the deputation of the Sanhedrim to John (i. 19 ff.). The conduct of the people and the authorities, with regard to the solemn procedure of Jesus in the temple (ii. 12 ff.), had given Him the measure of that which awaited Him. The words of Nicodemus himself (iii. 2), in which he had called Him teacher in consideration of His miracles, not of His teaching itself (ver. 2), showed how little His word had found access to hearts. The want of spiritual receptivity, which the misunderstanding of Nicodemus had just betrayed, will,

as Jesus perceives, render very difficult the acceptance of the heavenly revelations which he brings to the world:

Ver. 12. "*If I have told you earthly things and ye believe*[1] *not, how shall ye believe if I tell you*[2] *of heavenly things?*" When a teacher says to his pupil: "If you do not understand me on this point, how will you understand me on that?" we must suppose that the disciple expects to be instructed respecting this latter point. We must, therefore, conclude from this word of Jesus, that *the heavenly things* are to Jesus' view those which preoccupy Nicodemus, and with reference to which he had come to interrogate Him: the person of the Messiah, the nature of His kingdom, the way in which He will lay the foundation of, and complete this great work, both in Israel and in the Gentile world. And, indeed, these are precisely the questions which Jesus answers in the second part of the conversation, which is to follow. The contrast between the past, "if I *have told* you" and the present "if I *tell* you" proves that Jesus had not yet set forth publicly what He calls the *heavenly things*. This conversation was the first communication of Jesus concerning the nature of the Messianic kingdom and the mode of salvation, outside of the innermost circle of His own friends. The public teaching of Jesus had, therefore, up to that time related to what He calls *the earthly things*. This expression cannot denote things which appertain to earthly interests: for Jesus did not occupy Himself with these things before this, any more than He did afterwards. If by the heavenly things we must of course understand the designs of God, inaccessible to the human mind, for the establishment of His kingdom, we must include in the domain of *earthly things* all that which appertains to the *moral* nature of man; outside of the region of redemption and regeneration; thus, everything which Jesus comes to declare respecting the carnal state of the natural man and the necessity of a radical transformation. Jesus is thinking, no doubt, of the contents of His first preachings, analogous to those of John the Baptist, and which Mark sums up (i. 15) in these words: "*Repent ye, and believe the Gospel: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand;*" those preachings of which we possess the most remarkable example in the Sermon on the Mount. What a difference as compared with the revelations which Jesus makes to Nicodemus! The conversation with him is the first step in a region infinitely elevated above that elementary preaching. We understand now why it has been preserved to us by John; it had been of marked importance in the development of his own faith.

According to *Lücke* and *Reuss* the earthly things are the things easy to be understood, and the heavenly "the most elevated ideas of the Gospel, less accessible to an intelligence which was not yet enlightened by it." This sense is true from the standpoint of consequences, but not from that of explanation strictly so-called. There is no example to prove that heavenly can signify difficult, and earthly, easy. *Ewald* makes of εἶπον a

[1] E H 10 Mnn.: ουκ επιστευσατε (*ye did not believe*), instead of ου πιστευετε (*ye do not believe*).

[2] The second υμιν is wanting in E H 9 Mnn. Ital[iq].

third person plural: "*If they* (the prophets) have spoken to you of earthly things and you *have not believed* (the reading: ἐπιστεύσατε)." But a subject of this sort could not be understood, and an ἐγώ could not be omitted in the following clause (*Meyer, Bäumlein*). In this remarkable saying, Jesus contrasts the facts which pertain to the domain of the human consciousness, and which man can verify by observation of himself, with the divine decrees which cannot be known except by means of a revelation. This is the reasoning: "If, when I have declared to you the things whose reality you can, by consulting your own consciousness, discover, you have not believed, how will you believe when I shall reveal to you the secrets of heaven, which must be received solely on the foundation of a word?" There, the testimony of the inner sense facilitates faith; here, on the contrary, everything rests upon confidence in the testimony of the revealer. This testimony being rejected, the ladder, on which man may raise himself to the knowledge of heavenly things, is broken, and the access to the divine secrets remain closed.

This saying of Jesus should teach apologetics to place the supporting point of faith in the declarations of the Gospel which are most immediately connected with the facts of consciousness and the moral needs of the soul. Its truth being once recognized in this domain where it can be verified by every one, it is already half-demonstrated in relation to those declarations which are connected with the purely divine domain. It will be completely so, as soon as it shall be established that these two parts, divine and human, of the Gospel, are adapted to one another as the two parts of one whole; that the moral needs of man which are proved by the one find their full satisfaction in the divine plans revealed in the other. The moral truth of the Gospel is the first guarantee of its religious truth.

Ver. 13. "*And no one hath ascended up to heaven except he who descended from heaven, the Son of man who is in heaven.*"[1] The question, "*how will you believe?*" (ver. 12) implied, in the thought of Him who proposed it, the necessity of faith. Ver. 13 justifies this necessity. The intermediate idea is the following: "Indeed, without faith in my testimony, there is no access for you to those heavenly things which thou desirest to know." Καί: *and yet*. *Olshausen, de Wette, Lücke, Luthardt* and *Meyer* find in ver. 13 the proof, not of the necessity of *faith* in the revelation contained in the teaching of Jesus, but of that in *revelation* in general. But this thesis is too purely theoretical to find a place in such a conversation. *Hengstenberg* thinks that Jesus here wishes to reveal *His divinity* as the first among the heavenly things which Nicodemus has need to know. *Meyer* rightly answers that the negative form of the proposition is inconsistent with this intention. Besides, Jesus would have employed, in that case, the expression *Son of God*, rather than *Son of man*. The general meaning of this saying is as follows: "You do not believe my word . . . And yet no one has ascended to heaven so as to behold the heavenly things and make them known to you, except He who has descended from it to

[1] ℵ B L T[b] Orig. (once) Euseb. omit the words ο ων εν τω ουρανω (*who is in heaven*).

live with you as a man, and who, even while living here below, abides there also; so that He alone knows them *de visu*, and so that, consequently, to believe in His teaching is for you the only means of knowing them." But how can Jesus say of Himself that He ascended to heaven? Did He speak of His ascension by way of anticipation (*Augustine, Calvin, Bengel, Hengstenberg*)? But His future ascension would not justify the necessity of faith in His earthly teaching. *Lücke, Olshausen, Beyschlag*, after the example of *Erasmus, Beza*, etc., think that heaven is here only the symbol of perfect communion with God—a communion to which Jesus had morally risen, and by virtue of which He alone possessed the adequate knowledge of God and of the things above. This sense would be admissible if the word *ascended* had not as its antithesis the term *descended*, which refers to a positive fact, that of the incarnation; the corresponding term *ascend* must, therefore, refer to a fact no less positive, or rather—since the verb is in the perfect and not the aorist—to a *state* resulting from a fact quite as positive. *Meyer* and *Weiss*, following *Jansen*, think that the idea of *ascending* may be regarded as applying only to men in general and that an abstraction from it can be made with reference to Jesus. Ascending is here only as if the indispensable condition *for all other men* of dwelling in heaven: "No one . . . except he who (without having ascended thither) has descended from it, he who is there essentially (*Meyer*), or who *was* there previously (*Weiss*)." This is an attempt to escape the difficulty of the *εἰ μή, except;* the fact of *being* in heaven is reserved for Jesus, while suppressing, so far as He is concerned, that of *ascending;* comp. the use of *εἰ μή* in Matt. xii. 4; Luke iv. 26, 27; Gal. i. 19. However, the case is not altogether the same in those passages. We might try to take the *εἰ μή* in the sense of *but*, like the Hebrew *ki im;* but in that case John must have written *κατέβη* instead of *ὁ καταβάς*: "No one has ascended, *but* the Son of man *descended*." The Socinians, perfectly understanding the difficulty, have had recourse to the hypothesis of a carrying away of Jesus to heaven, which was granted to Him at some time or other of His life before His public ministry. As for ourselves, we have no occasion to have recourse to such an hypothesis; we know a positive fact which is sufficient to explain the *has ascended* when we apply it to Jesus Himself; it is that which occurred at His baptism. Heaven was then opened to Him; He penetrated it deeply by His gaze; He read the heart of God, and knew at that moment everything which He was to reveal to men of the divine plan, the *heavenly things*. In proportion as the consciousness of His eternal relation as Son to the Father was given to Him, there necessarily resulted from it the knowledge of the love of God towards mankind. Comp. Matt. xi. 27.—*Heaven* is a state, before being a place. As *Gess* says: "To be in the Father is to be in heaven." Subsidiarily, no doubt, the word *heaven* takes also a local sense; for this spiritual state of things is realized most perfectly in whatever sphere of the universe is resplendent with all the glory of the manifestation of God. The moral sense of the word *heaven* prevails in the first and third clauses; the local sense must be added to it in the second. "No one has ascended

. . . " signifies thus: "No one has *entered into* communion with God and possesses thereby an intuitive knowledge of divine things, in order to reveal them to others, except He to whom heaven was opened and who dwells there at this very moment."

And by virtue of what was Jesus, and Jesus alone, admitted to such a privilege? Because heaven is His original home. He alone has ascended thither, because He only descended thence. The term *descended* implies in His case the consciousness of having personally lived in heaven (*Gess*). This word denotes, therefore, more than a divine mission; it implies the abasement of the incarnation, and consequently involves the notion of pre-existence. It is an evident advance upon Nicodemus' profession of faith (ver. 2). The filial intimacy to which Jesus is exalted rests on His essential Sonship, previous to His earthly life. If the word *descended* implies pre-existence, the term, *Son of man*, brings out the *human* side in this heavenly revealer. The love of mankind impelled Him to become one of us, in order that He might speak to us as a man, and might instruct us in heavenly things in a manner intelligible to us. The recollection of Prov. xxx. 4 seems not to be foreign to the expression which Jesus makes use of: "Do I know the knowledge of the holy ones? Who ascendeth to heaven and descendeth from it?"—The last words: *who is in heaven* are preserved in the text by *Tischendorf* (8th ed.) and by *Meyer*, notwithstanding the Alexandrian authorities; *Westcott* rightly says: "They have against them the ancient MSS., and for them the ancient versions." But according to this critic, the testimony of the versions is in this case remarkably weakened by the contrary testimony of the Sinaitic MS. which so often accords with them. The rejection may have been the result of an accidental omission or of the difficulty of reconciling this addition with the idea of the preceding clause;—that of having *descended*. On the other hand, we can understand how these words may have been interpolated, in order to resolve the apparent contradiction between the idea of *being* in heaven in order to have ascended thither, and that of having *descended*. At all events, the idea which these words express, that of the actual presence of Christ in heaven, is already very positively contained in the *perfect* ἀναβέβηκεν, *has ascended*. This tense indeed does not signify: has accomplished at a given moment the act of ascending (this would be the sense of the aorist), but He is there, He lives there, as having ascended thither. Thus the preceding antithesis is resolved. Jesus lives in heaven, as a being who has re-ascended thither after having descended in order to become Son of man (xvi. 28). The Lord led two lives parallel to each other, an earthly life and a heavenly life. He lived in His Father, and, while living thus with the Father, He gave Himself unceasingly to men in His human life. The teaching *in parables*, in which the heavenly things take on His lips an earthly dress, is the true language answering to that existence which is formed of two simultaneous lives, the one penetrating the other.

Some interpreters (*Luthardt*, *Weiss*), understand the participle (ὁ ὤν), in the sense of the imperfect *who was* (before the incarnation); this word, ac-

cording to them, expresses the idea of pre-existence as a condition of the καταβαίνειν, of the act of *descending*. But this participle (ὁ ὤν), if it is authentic, is rather in relation with the principal verb: *has ascended*, than with the participle (ὁ καταβάς). "He lives in heaven, having re-ascended thither, inasmuch as He has descended thence." To express, without ambiguity, the idea of the imperfect, the periphrasis (ὃς ἦν) would have been necessary; *Lücke* sees in ὁ ὤν a perpetual present. This idea may be applied to i. 18, where the question is of the Son of God, but not to our passage, where the subject is the *Son of man*.

Meyer, *Weiss* and *Keil* maintain that Jesus explains here the knowledge which He has of divine things by His pre-existence. Such an idea can be found in these words only on condition of denying any application of the idea of *ascending* to Jesus, a thing which is impossible. The higher knowledge of Jesus is, much rather, presented here as the result of an initiation (*has ascended*), which took place for Him during the course of His human existence, and through which He received at a certain time the immediate and constant, though truly human, intuition of divine things. And, in fact, this is the impression which every word of Jesus produces: that of a man who perceives the divine directly, but who perceives it with a human consciousness like our own. It is impossible for me to understand how *Weiss* can, on the one hand, make this higher knowledge proceed from a recollection of His anterior existence, and maintain, on the other, that such knowledge "does not go beyond the limits of a truly human consciousness." The Son of man, living in heaven, so as to have re-ascended thither after having descended, is the sole revealer of divine things: this is the first of the ἐπουράνια, the heavenly secrets, which Jesus communicates to Nicodemus. The second is the salvation of men through the lifting up of this same Son of man, not on a throne, but on a cross, the supreme wonder of divine love to the world: vv. 14–16. This is the *essential contents* of the revelation which Jesus announced to him in ver. 13.

Vv. 14, 15. "*And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, so must the Son of man be lifted up*, 15, *that whosoever believeth on him*,[1] *may have eternal life*." The commentators give more or less forced explanations of καί (*and*). *Lücke*: "I *can* reveal (vv. 11–13), and I *must* do so" (vv. 14–16). *Olshausen*: "I give not only my *word*, but my *person*." *De Wette*: "Jesus passes from the theoretical to the practical." *Meyer* and *Luthardt*: "He has spoken of the *necessity* of faith; He speaks now of its *sweetness*." *Weiss*: "There is here a new motive to believe. The elevation of Jesus will give salvation only by means of *faith*." All this is too artificial. From our point of view, the connection is more simple: the καί *and*, and also, adds a second divine mystery to the first, the decree of *redemption* to that of *revelation*.

The central idea of this verse is that of the lifting up of the Messiah.

[1] Instead of εις αυτον, which T. R. reads with 14 Mjj. (among them ℵ), nearly all the Mnn.: Itplur.; Vg; Chrys.; επ' αυτον is read in A, επ' αυτω in L, εν αυτω in B Tb. ℵ B L Tb; some Mnn.; Syrcur.; Italiq., omit the words μη απολητα αλλ'.

Three principal explanations have been given of the word ὑψωθῆναι (*to be lifted up*). It has been applied either to the spiritual glory which the moral perfection which He will display in His sufferings will procure for Jesus in the hearts of men (*Paulus*), or to His elevation to heavenly glory which will take place as following upon His death (*Bleek*), or finally, to the very fact of His suspension on the cross; this last interpretation is the one most generally received. And indeed, in the one or the other of the first meanings, Jesus would rather have used the term δοξασθῆναι (*to be glorified*). For the third, the following points decide the case: 1. The comparison with the serpent raised to the top of the pole, which certainly had nothing glorious in it; 2. The naturally material sense of the word ὑψωθῆναι (*to be lifted up*); finally, 3. The relation of this word to the corresponding Aramaic term *zekaph*, which is applied to the suspension of malefactors. Only we must take account of the allusion which Jesus, in using this term (*being lifted up*), certainly made to the ideas of Nicodemus, according to which the Messiah was to ascend the throne of Solomon and rule the world. And the voluntary and ironical amphibology of this expression will be understood as in connection with the Messianic expectation of the Pharisees. To perceive this shade, we must strongly emphasize the οὕτως: (*it is thus*)—and not as you picture it to yourselves—that the *lifting up* of the Son of man will take place. This word (*will be lifted up*), intimates indeed that by this strange elevation the Son of man will attain not only to the throne of David, but to that of God. Such is the full meaning of the word: *to be lifted up*. We must not, as *Meyer* does, refuse to follow the thought of Jesus in this rapid evolution, which instantaneously brings together the greatest contrasts, if we would understand all the depth and all the richness of His words. We find here again the same enigmatical character as in ii. 19. The fact related in Num. xxi. 9, is one of the most astonishing in sacred history. Three peculiarities distinguish this mode of deliverance from all the other analogous miracles: 1. It is *the plague itself*, which, represented as overcome, becomes, by its ignominious exposure, the means of its own defeat; 2. This exposure takes place, not in a *real* serpent—the suspension in that case would have proclaimed only the defeat of the individual exposed—but in a typical copy, which represents the entire species; 3. This expedient becomes efficacious through the intervention of a moral act, the look of faith on the part of each injured person. If this is the type of salvation, it follows from this fact that this salvation will be wrought in the following way: 1. Sin will be exposed publicly as vanquished, and for the future powerless; 2. It will not be in the person of a real sinner—which would proclaim only the particular defeat of *that* sinner—but in the person of a holy man, capable of representing, as a living image, the condemnation and defeat of sin, *as such*; 3. This exhibition of sin as one who is vanquished, will save each sinner only by means of an act on his part, the look of faith upon his spiritual enemy condemned and vanquished. Here, Jesus declares, is the salvation on which the establishment of the Kingdom will be founded; here is the second heavenly decree revealed to men. What a reversal of the Messianic programme of

Nicodemus! But, at the same time, what appropriateness in the choice of this Scriptural type, designed to rectify the ideas of the old doctor in Israel!

"*Must*," says Jesus; and first, for the fulfillment of the prophecies; then, for that of the divine decree, of which the prophecies were only an emanation (*Hengstenberg*); let us add, finally; and for the satisfaction of certain moral necessities, known to God only. The designation, *Son of man*, is here, as at ver. 13, chosen with a marked design. It is on the complete homogeneousness of His nature with ours, that the mysterious substitution rests, which is proclaimed in this verse, precisely as it was on this same community of nature that the act of revelation rested, which was announced in the preceding verse.

Ver. 15 finishes the application of the type. To the look of the dying Israelite the faith of the sinner in the crucified one corresponds; to the life restored to the wounded one, the salvation granted to the believer.— Πᾶς, *whosoever* extends to the whole of humanity the application of the Israelitish type, while emphatically individualizing the act of faith (ὁ).— The reading of the T. R. εἰς αὐτόν, *to* or *on Him*, is the one which best suits the context (the look turned *towards* . . .); faith looks *to* its object. If we consider how little the Alexandrian authorities agree among themselves, the received reading will be acknowledged as, on the whole, the best supported one. *Tischendorf* (8th ed.) reads ἐν αὐτῷ, after the Vatican MS.; in that case, this limiting phrase may be connected with ἔχῃ, as *Weiss* and *Keil* connect it, rather than with πιστεύων. But, in this context, the connection with πιστεύων remains, nevertheless, the most natural relation. The Alexandrian authorities reject the words μὴ ἀπόληται ἀλλά *should not perish, but;* they may certainly have been introduced here from ver. 16. Even in that case we are struck with the rhythmic relation between the last words of these two verses; it is the sign of the stirring of feeling and elevation of thought (Introd., p. 137). We comprehend, indeed, what an impression this first revelation of His future suffering of punishment must have produced on Jesus Himself; comp. xii. 27. As for Nicodemus, we also account for what he experienced when on the Holy Friday he saw Jesus suspended on the cross. That spectacle, instead of being for him, as for others, a stumbling-block, a ground of unbelief and despair, causes his latent faith to break forth (xix. 39). This fact is the answer to *de Wette's* question, who asks if this anticipatory revelation of the death of the Messiah was not contrary to the pedagogic wisdom of Jesus. *Weiss*, who is not willing to admit that Jesus so early foresaw and predicted His death, thinks that Jesus did not express Himself in so precise a way, but that he spoke vaguely of some lifting up which would be accorded to Him during His earthly life, to the end that He might be recognized as Messiah by the Jews. But, in that case, it is necessary to suppose: 1. That John positively falsified the account of the words of Jesus; 2. That Jesus spoke of something which was never realized, for we know not what that supposed lifting-up can be; 3. There no longer remains, in this case, any relation between the prophecy of Jesus and the matter of

the brazen serpent. From the cross Jesus ascends to God, from whose love this decree emanates (δεῖ *must*, ver. 14).

Ver. 16. "*For God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish, but should have eternal life.*"—Here is the ἐπουράνιον, the heavenly mystery, *par excellence;* Jesus displays the source of the redemptive work, which He has just described; it is the love of God itself. The *world*, that fallen humanity of which God in the Old Testament had left the largest part outside of His theocratic government and revelation, and which the Pharisees devoted to wrath and judgment, Jesus presents to Nicodemus as the object of the most boundless love: "*God so loved the world . . .*" The gift which God makes to it is *the Son*,—not only the Son of man, as He was called vv. 13, 14 in relation to His humanity, but His *only-begotten Son.* The intention, in fact, is no longer to make prominent the homogeneity of nature between this Redeemer and those whom He is to instruct and save, but the boundlessness of the love of the Father; now this love appears from what this messenger is for the Father Himself. It has been claimed that this term, only-begotten Son, was ascribed to Jesus by the evangelist. For what reason? Because, both in his Prologue (i. 14–18), and in his Epistle (iv. 9) he himself makes use of it. But this term is, in the LXX., the translation of the Hebrew יחיד (Ps. xxv. 16; xxxv. 17; Prov. iv. 3). Why should not Jesus have employed this word if He was, as we cannot doubt (Matt. xi. 27; xxi. 37), conscious of His unique relation to God? And how should the evangelist have been able to render it in Greek otherwise than the LXX. had rendered it? Man had once offered to God his only son; could God, in a matter of love, remain behind His creature?—The choice of the verb is equally significant; it is the word for *giving*, and not only for sending; to give, to surrender, and that, if necessary, even to the last limits of sacrifice.—The last clause produces the effect of a musical refrain (comp. ver. 14). It is the homage rendered by the Son to the love of the Father from which everything proceeds. The universality of salvation (*whosoever*), the easiness of the means (*believeth*), the greatness of the evil prevented (*should not perish*), the boundlessness, in excellence and in duration, of the good bestowed (*eternal life*): all these heavenly ideas, new to Nicodemus, are crowded into this sentence, which closes the exposition of the true Messianic salvation.—According to this passage, redemption is not extorted from the divine love; it is its thought, it is its work. It is the same with Paul: "*All things are of God, who reconciled us unto Himself by Jesus Christ*" (2 Cor. v. 18). This spontaneous love of the Father for the sinful world is not incompatible with the wrath and the threatenings of judgment; for here is not the love of communion, which unites the pardoned sinner to God; but a love of compassion, like that which we feel towards the unfortunate or enemies. The intensity of this love results from the very greatness of the unhappiness which awaits him who is its object. Thus are united in this very expression the two apparently incompatible ideas which are contained in the words: *so loved* and *may not perish.* Some theologians, beginning with *Erasmus* (*Neander, Tholuck, Olshausen, Bäum-*

lein) have supposed that the conversation of Jesus and Nicodemus closes with ver. 15, and that, from ver. 16, it is the evangelist who speaks, commenting with his own reflections on the words of his Master. This opinion finds its support in the past tenses, *loved* and *were*, ver. 19, which seem to designate a more advanced period than that at which Jesus conversed with Nicodemus; in the expression μονογενής, *only-begotten Son*, which belongs to John's language; finally, in the fact that, from this point, the dialogue-form wholly ceases. The *for* of ver. 16, is, on this view, designed to introduce John's explanations; and the repetition in the same verse of the words of ver. 15 are, as it were, the affirmation of the disciple answering to the Master's declaration.—But, on the other hand, the *for* of ver. 16 is not a sufficient indication of the passing from the teaching of Jesus to the commentary of the disciple. The author must have marked much more distinctly such an important transition. Then, how can we imagine that the emotion which bears on the discourse from ver. 13 is already exhausted in ver 15? The increasing exaltation with which Jesus successively presents to Nicodemus the wonders of divine love, the incarnation (ver. 13) and redemption (vv. 14, 15), cannot end thus abruptly; the thought can rest only when it has once reached the highest principle from which these unheard of gifts flow, the infinite love of the Father. To give glory to God, is the goal to which the heart of Jesus always tends. Finally, who could believe that He would have dryly sent Nicodemus away after the words of ver. 15, without having given him a glimpse of the effects of the salvation announced, and without having addressed to him for himself a word of encouragement? Would this be the affectionate sympathy of a truly human heart? The part of Jesus, in that case, would be reduced to that of a cold catechist. The difficulties which have given occasion to this opinion do not seem to us very serious. The past tenses of ver. 19 are justified in the mouth of Jesus, like the reproach of ver. 11: "*You receive not our testimony*," by the attitude, which the population and authorities of the capital had already taken (ii. 19). We have justified by the context the term *only-begotten Son*, and have seen that it would hardly be natural to refuse it to Jesus Himself. The terms *new birth*, *birth of water* and *birth of the Spirit* (vv. 3, 5) are also not found in the rest of Jesus' discourses; must we, for this reason, doubt that they are His? In a kind of discoursing so original as His, does not the matter, at each moment, create an original form? When we remember that the ἅπαξ λεγόμενα (words employed only once) are counted by hundreds in the Epistles of St. Paul (two hundred and thirty in the first epistle to the Corinthians, one hundred and forty-three in the epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians taken together, one hundred and eighteen in the Ep. to the Hebrews), how can we conclude from the fact that a term is found only once in the discourses of Jesus which have been preserved to us, that it does not really belong to His language? Finally, the cessation of the dialogue-form results simply from the increasing surprise and humble docility with which Nicodemus, from this point onwards, receives the revelation of the heavenly things. In reality, notwithstanding this silence, the dialogue none the less continues.

For, in what follows, as in what precedes, Jesus does not express an idea, does not pronounce a word, which is not in direct relation to the thoughts and needs of His interlocutor, and that as far as ver. 21, where we find, at last, the word of encouragement which naturally closes the conversation, and softens the painful impression which must have been left in the heart of the old man by the abrupt and severe admonition with which it had begun.—*De Wette* and *Lücke*, while maintaining that the author makes Jesus speak even to the end, nevertheless think that, without himself being conscious of it, he mingled more and more his own reflections with the words of his Master. Nearly the same is also the opinion of *Weiss*, who thinks that, in general, John has never given an account of the discourses of Jesus except by developing them in his own style. If, in what follows, we find any expression wanting in appropriateness, any thought unconnected with the given situation, it will indeed be necessary to accept such a judgment. If the contrary is the fact, we shall have the right to exclude this last supposition also.

One idea is inseparable from that of redemption,—it is that of *judgment*. Every Pharisee divided man into the saved and the judged, that is to say, into circumcised and uncircumcised, into Jews and Gentiles. Jesus, who has just revealed the redeeming love towards the whole world, unfolds now to Nicodemus the nature of the true judgment. And this revelation also is a complete transformation of the received opinion. It will not be between Jews and Gentiles, it will be between *believers* and *unbelievers*, whatever may be their nationality, that the line of demarcation will pass.

Ver. 17. "*For God sent not his*[1] *Son into the world to judge the world, but that the world might be saved through him.*" *For:* the purpose of the mission of the Son, as it is indicated in this verse, proves that this mission is indeed a work of love (ver. 16). The word, *world*, is repeated three times with emphasis. Nicodemus must hear in such a way as no more to forget that the divine benevolence embraces all humanity. The universalism of Paul, in its germ, is in these verses 16, 17. The first clause, by its negative form, is intended to exclude the Jewish idea, according to which the immediate purpose of the coming of the Messiah was to execute the judgment on the Gentile nations. Our versions translate, κρίνειν, in general, with the meaning *condemn; Meyer* himself still defends this meaning. It is explained thus: "Jesus did not come to execute a judgment *of condemnation* on the sinful world." But why should not Jesus have said κατακρίνειν, *to condemn*, if He had this thought? What He means to say is, that His coming into the world has for its purpose, not an act of judgment, but a work of salvation. *Reuss* concludes from this saying that "the idea of a future and universal judgment is repudiated" in our Gospel. But the future judgment is clearly taught in vv. 27, 28. The idea which Jesus sets aside in this saying, is only that the present coming of the Messiah has for its purpose a great external judicial

[1] ℵ B L T^{b} and some Mnn. omit αυτου.

act, like that which the Pharisee Nicodemus was certainly expecting. If a judgment is to take place as a personal act of the Messiah, it does not appertain to this coming. However, although the *purpose* of His coming is to save, not to judge, a judgment, but an altogether different one from that of which the Jews were thinking, was about to be effected because of that coming: a judgment of a moral nature, in which it is not Jesus who will pronounce the sentence, but every man will himself decide his own salvation or perdition.

Ver. 18. "*He that believeth on him is not judged; but*[1] *he that believeth not is judged already, because he hath not believed on the name of the only-begotten Son of God.*" The idea of this verse is as follows: "I do not judge any one, for the reason that he who believes is not judged, and he who does not believe has already judged himself." As has been well said: "Here is justification by faith, and condemnation by unbelief."[2] Jesus does not judge the believer, because he who accepts the salvation which He brings is no longer a subject of judgment. *Meyer, Hengstenberg*, etc., and our translators [A. V.] render the word κρίνειν here also by *condemn*. *Weiss, Keil, Westcott* acknowledge that this sense is arbitrary. The passage in v. 24 shows that it is contrary to the true thought of Jesus. *To judge* is, after a detailed investigation of the acts, to pronounce on their author a judicial sentence deciding as to his innocence or his guilt. Now the Lord declares that the believer, being already introduced into eternal life, will not be subjected to an investigation of this kind. He will appear before the tribunal, indeed, according to Rom. xiv. 10; 2 Cor. v. 10, but to be recognized as saved and to receive his place in the kingdom (Matt. xxv.). If faith withdraws man from the judgment, there is in this nothing arbitrary. This follows precisely from the fact that, through the interior judgment of repentance which precedes and follows faith, the believer is introduced into the sphere of Christian sanctification which is a continual judgment of oneself, and consequently the free anticipation of the judgment (1 Cor. xi. 31). The present οὐ κρίνεται, *is not judged*, is that of the idea. Jesus does not judge the unbeliever, because he who refuses to believe finds his judgment in this very refusal. The word ἤδη, *already*, and the substitution of the perfect (κέκριται) for the present (κρίνεται) show clearly that Jesus is thinking here of a judgment of a spiritual nature, which is exercised here below on him who rejects the salvation offered in Christ. Such a man has pronounced on himself, by his unbelief, and without any need on the part of Jesus of intervening judicially, his own sentence. It is self-evident that this sentence is a sentence of condemnation. But the word does not say this. The meaning is: The one is not to be judged; the other is judged already; consequently, the Son does not have to intervene personally in order to judge. The use here of the subjective negative (the first μή) belongs, according to *Bäumlein*, to the decline of the language. According to *Meyer*, this form has, on the contrary, its regular sense: "*in not* believing," or "*because* he does not believe." The title of *only-begotten*

[1] ℵ B Ital^{q}. Orig.: ὁ μη, for ὁ δε μη in all the rest.

[2] H. Jacottet.

Son sets forth the guilt of those who reject such a being and the work which He accomplishes. The more glorious the Saviour is, the more grave a matter it is to turn away from Him. The more holy He is, divine in His entire manifestation, the more does unbelief towards Him bear witness of a profane sentiment. *His name:* the revelation which He gives us of His essence (see i. 12). The perfect *μὴ πεπίστευκεν, has not believed*, denotes not the *act* of not believing, but the *state* which results from it. "Because he is not in the favorable position of a man who has given his confidence to such a being." The *μή* is used here as among the later Greeks (e. g. Lucian) to denote the cause *in the thought* of the speaker. The moral separation between men, described in ver. 18, constitutes the judgment in its essence; this is the idea developed in vv. 19–21. By the position which men take with regard to Jesus, they class themselves as reproved (vv. 19, 20) or saved (ver. 21). Thus far, Jesus has proved that He does not judge, but He does this by contrasting with the outward judgment, which was expected, a moral judgment of which no one dreamed. This judgment it is which He now explains.

Ver. 19. "*Now this is the judgment, that the light is come into the world, and men loved the darkness rather than the light; for their works were evil.*" In rejecting Jesus, man judges himself. The strictest inquiry into his whole life would not *prove* his disposition, as opposed to what is good, better than does his unbelief. The final judicial act will have nothing more to do than to ratify this sentence which he pronounces on himself (vv. 28, 29). In order to make the matter understood, the Lord here calls Himself *the light*, that is to say, the manifested good, the divine holiness realized before the human conscience. It follows from this, that the attitude which the man takes in relation to Him, reveals infallibly his inmost moral tendency. To the view of Jesus, the experiment has been already made for the world which surrounds Him: "*Men loved rather . . .*" There is in every servant of God, in proportion to his holiness, a spiritual tact which makes him discern immediately the moral sympathy or antipathy which his person and his message excite. The visit of Jesus to Jerusalem had been for Him a sufficient revelation of the moral state of the people and their rulers. They are *the men* of whom He speaks in this verse, but with the distinct feeling that they are in this point the representatives of fallen humanity. The expression *loved rather* is not designed, as *Lücke* thinks, to extenuate the guilt of unbelievers, by intimating that there is still in them an attraction, but a weaker one, towards the truth. As has been well said, the word *μᾶλλον* does not mean *magis, more*, but *potius, rather*. This word, therefore, aggravates the responsibility of the Jews, by bringing out the free preference with which, though placed in presence of the light, they have chosen the darkness (comp. ver. 11). What is, indeed, the ground of this guilty preference? It is that *their works are evil*. They are determined to persevere in the evil which they have hitherto committed; this is the reason why they flee from the light which condemns it. By displaying the true nature of their works, the light would force them to renounce them. The term *τὸ σκότος, the darkness*, includes with the love

of evil the inward falsehood by which a man seeks to exculpate himself. The aorist ἠγάπησαν, *loved*, designates the preference as an act which has just been consummated recently, while the imperfect ἦν, *were*, presents the life of the world in evil as a fact existing long before the appearance of the light. The word ἔργα, *works*, denotes the whole moral activity, tendency and acts. In the following verse, Jesus explains, by means of a comparison, the psychological relation between immorality, gross or subtle, and unbelief.

Ver. 20. "*For, every one who practiseth evil hateth the light and doth not come to the light*,[1] *that his works may not be condemned.*" Night was reigning at the moment when Jesus was speaking thus. How many evil-doers were taking advantage of the darkness, to pursue their criminal designs! And it was not accidental that they had chosen this hour. Such is the image of that which takes place in the moral world. The appearance of Jesus is for the world like the rising of the sun; it manifests the true character of human actions; whence it follows, that when any one does evil *and wishes to persevere in it*, he turns his back upon Jesus and His holiness. If his conscience came to be enlightened by this brightness, it would oblige him to renounce that which he wishes to keep. He denies therefore, and this negation is for him the night in which he can continue to sin: such is the genesis of unbelief. The expression ὁ φαῦλα πράσσων, *he who does evil*, denotes not only the tendency to which the man has hitherto surrendered himself, but also that in which he desires to persevere. This is what the *present* participle πράσσων (instead of the past πράξας) expresses. For the word πονηρά (*perverse things*) is substituted the word φαῦλα (*things of nought*) of ver. 19; the latter is taken from the estimate of Jesus himself, while the former referred to the intrinsic nature of the acts, to their fundamental depravity. We must also notice a difference between the two verbs πράττειν and ποιεῖν: the first indicates simply labor—the question is of works of nought—the second implies effective realization, in the good the product remains. But we need not believe that the term *practise evil* refers only to what we call immoral conduct. Jesus is certainly thinking, also, of a life externally honorable, but destitute of all serious moral reality, like that of the greater part of the rulers in Israel, and particularly of the Pharisees: the exaltation of the *I* and the pursuit of human glory, as well as gross immorality, belong to the φαῦλα πράττειν, "*practise things of nought*" in the sense in which Jesus understands it.—Μισεῖ, *he hates*, expresses the instinctive, immediate antipathy; οὐκ ἔρχεται, *he comes not*, denotes the deliberate resolution. The verb ἐλέγχειν (perhaps from πρὸς ἕλην κρίνειν, to hold to the light in order to judge) signifies: to bring to light the erroneous or evil nature of an idea or a deed.

The reason of unbelief, therefore, is not intellectual, but moral. The proof which Jesus gives, in ver. 20, of this so grave fact is perfectly lucid. All that Pascal has written most profoundly on the relation between the

[1] ℵ alone omits και ουκ ερχεται εις το φως (*and he does not come to the light*) evidently by reason of a confounding of the two φως on the part of the copyist.

will and the understanding, the heart and the belief, is already in advance contained in this verse and the one which follows. But that which is true of unbelief is equally true of faith. It also strikes its roots into the moral life; here is the other side of the judgment:

Ver. 21. "*But he that doeth the truth cometh to the light, that his works may be made manifest*[1] *because they are wrought in God.*" Sincere love of moral good predisposes to faith; for Jesus is the good personified. There are in humanity, even before the appearance of Christ, men who, although like others affected by inborn evil, react against their evil inclinations, and pursue with a noble ardor the realization of the moral ideal which shines before them. Jesus here calls them *those who do the truth.* St. Paul, also in accord with St. John on this point, describes them as those who *by persevering in well-doing seek for glory, honor and incorruption* (Rom. ii. 7). This earnest aspiration after the good, which the theocratic discipline stimulates and protects in Israel, forms a contrast to the mummeries of the Pharisaic righteousness. It can be present in a penitent publican, no less than in an irreproachable Pharisee. The same idea is found again in the expressions *to be of God, to be of the truth* (viii. 47, xviii. 37). This disposition is the condition of all real faith in the Gospel. The adherence of the will to the preparatory revelation of God, whether in the law of conscience or in that of Moses, is the first condition of the adherence to the higher revelation of divine holiness in Jesus Christ. The expression *to do the truth* denotes the persevering effort to raise one's conduct to the height of one's moral consciousness, to realize the ideal of the good perceived by the conscience; comp. Rom. vii. The soul which, it may be, in consequence of the bitter experience of sin, longs after holiness, recognizes in Jesus its realized ideal and that by which it will itself attain to the realization of it. The figurative expression *to come to the light* signifies to draw near to Jesus, to listen to Him with docility, to surrender oneself to Him; comp. Luke xv. 1, 2. Is there not, in the choice of this figure, a delicate allusion to the present course of Nicodemus? As truly as this night which reigns without is the figure of the unbelief in which the lovers of sin envelop themselves, so really is this light around which these few interlocutors meet, the emblem of the divine brightness which Nicodemus came to seek for. And so it will come to pass. It is the farewell of Jesus: Thou desirest the good; it is this which brings thee here. Take courage! Thou shalt find it!

If the upright hearts come to the light, it is because they do not, like those spoken of before, dread the manifestation of the true character of their conduct; on the contrary, they desire it: To the end, says Jesus, "*that their works may be manifested because they are done in God.*" I return thus to the ordinary translation of the close of this verse. I had previously preferred the following: That they may be manifested as being done in God; comp. for this Greek construction, iv. 35. But the first construction

[1] ℵ omits almost the whole of this verse as far as οτι (confusion of the two εργα αυτου, vv. 20, 21, a portion of the authorities in ver. 21 placing αυτου after εργα).

is more natural here. The truly righteous man seeks, as Nicodemus did, to come into contact with Christ, the living holiness, because he has within him nothing which impels him to withdraw himself from the light of God; on the contrary, the nature of his works is the cause of his being happy to find himself fully in that light. The expression *wrought in God* seems very strong to characterize the works of the sincere man before he has found Christ. But let us not forget that, both in Israel and even beyond the theocratic sphere, it is from a divine impulse that everything good in human life proceeds. It is the Father who draws souls to the Son, and who gives them to Him (vi. 37, 44). It is God who causes to resound in the sincere soul the signal for the strife, ineffectual though it be, against inborn evil (Rom. vii.). Wherever there is docility on the part of man towards this divine initiative, this expression *works wrought in God* is applicable, which comprehends as well the sighs of the humbled publican and the repentant believer as the noble aspirations of a John or a Nathanael. Such a man, conscious of his sincere desire for the good, does not fear to expose himself to the light and consequently to come to Christ. The more he acts *in God*, the more he desires to see clearly within himself, to the end of attaining a still more perfect obedience. In the previous editions, I had referred the *in order that* to the need of a holy approbation. *Weiss* sees in it the desire to show that the good works accomplished are those of God and not those of the man. I think that the question is rather of a need of *progress*. *Luthardt* seems to me to have completely perverted the meaning of this verse and to have lost the very profound teaching which it contains, by explaining: "He who practices the moral truth *manifested in Christ* soon attaches himself to Christ by the religious bond of faith." But does not the practice of the holiness revealed in Christ necessarily imply faith in Him? The saying of Jesus in vii. 17 has a striking analogy to this.

"In humanity anterior to Christ," says *Lücke* rightly, "two kinds of men are mingled together. With the appearance of Jesus, the separating begins;" αὕτη ἡ κρίσις. "Under the trees of the same forest," observes *Lange*, "all sorts of birds find shelter together during the night. But in the morning, as soon as the sun sheds forth his rays, some close their eyes and seek the darkest retreat, while others clap their wings and salute the sun with their songs. Thus the appearing of Christ separates the lovers of the day from those of the night, mingled together until then in the mass of mankind." We must not, however, understand this idea in the sense which the Tübingen school ascribes to the evangelist: That there are two kinds of men opposite in their nature. All the expressions used by John: "They *loved rather*," "*to practise* evil things," "*to do* the truth," are, much rather, borrowed from the domain of free choice and deliberate action. (Comp. Introd., pp. 132 f.).

It is with this word of hope that Jesus takes leave of Nicodemus. And we can easily understand why, in contrast with John the Baptist's course (ver. 36), Jesus spoke, in the first place, of those who reject the light (vv. 19, 20), and, in the second place, of those who seek it (ver. 21). He wished to terminate the conversation with a word of encouragement addressed

to His interlocutor. He had recognized in him one of those righteous souls who will one day believe and whom faith will lead to the baptism of water, and thereby to the baptism of the Spirit. Henceforth Jesus waits for him. *Reuss* deems the silence of John respecting his departure surprising. "We have, indeed, seen him come; but we do not see him go away. We are wholly ignorant of the result of this interview." Then this scholar boldly draws therefrom a proof against the historical reality of the personage of Nicodemus and his conversation with Jesus. Is this objection serious? The evangelist should then have told us expressly, that Nicodemus, on leaving Jesus, returned to his own home and went to bed! Does not the effect produced upon him by the conversation appear plainly from the later history? Comp. vii. 50, 51; xix. 39. John respects the mystery of the inner working which had just begun, and leaves the facts to speak. It is the revelation of Jesus to Nicodemus which is the subject of this narrative, and not the biography of this Pharisee. No more does Matthew mention the return of the Twelve after their first mission (chap. x.); does it follow from this that their mission is not historical? The narrative of our Gospels is wholly devoted to the religious end and does not entertain itself with empty details.

We are now in a condition to give a judgment respecting this interview. It seems to me that its historical character follows from the perfect appositeness, which we have established, in all the words of Jesus and in their exact appropriateness to the given situation. The statement of ver. 1, "A man *of the Pharisees*" is found to be the key of the whole passage. Every word of Jesus is like a shot fired at close quarters with such an interlocutor. He begins by bringing home to this man who approaches Him, as well assured of his participation in the divine kingdom as of his very existence, a sense of all that which he lacks, and by saying, although in other terms: "*Unless thy righteousness surpasses that of the Scribes and Pharisees, thou shalt not enter the kingdom of heaven.*" After having thus made a void in this heart full of itself and its own righteousness, he endeavors to fill this void in the positive part of the conversation, in which He answers the questions which Nicodemus had proposed to present to Him. In this answer, He opposes, from the beginning to the end, programme to programme: first, Messiah to Messiah, then, salvation to salvation, finally, judgment to judgment, substituting with regard to each of these points the divine thought for the Pharisaic expectation. There is enough, as it seems to me, in this direct application, this constant fitness, and this unshaken steadiness of course in the conversation to guarantee its reality. An artificial composition of the second century would not have succeeded in adapting itself so perfectly to the given situation. In any case, the cohesion of all the parts of the conversation is too evident to allow of the distinction between the part belonging to Jesus and that belonging to the evangelist. Either the whole is a free composition of the latter, or the whole also must be regarded as the summary of a real conversation of Jesus. We say: the summary; for we certainly do not possess a complete report. The visit of Nicodemus, of course, continued longer than the few

minutes necessary for reading the account of it. John has transmitted to us in a few salient words the quintessence of the communications of Jesus at this juncture. This is what the quite vague transitions by means of a simple *and*, καί, indicate. We have before us the principal mountain peaks, but not the whole of the chain (comp. *Introd.*, p. 99).

III.—*Jesus in the Country of Judea:* III. 22–36.

The previous testimonies of John the Baptist were appeals to faith. That which is to follow assumes the character of a threatening protest against the generally hostile attitude and the rising unbelief of Israel. This discourse appertains, therefore, to the picture of the manifestation of Jesus and its general result in Israel.

After the feast of the Passover, Jesus did not immediately return to Galilee; the reason of this course of action will be pointed out in iv. 43–45. He repaired to the country region of Judea, where He set Himself to preach and baptize almost as John the Baptist was doing. Vv. 25, 26, lead us to suppose that the place where Jesus set Himself to the exercising of this ministry, was not far removed from that in which the forerunner was working.

How are we to explain this form, which the activity of Jesus assumes at this time? The temple was closed to Him and He had gone over the holy city, without meeting in it any other man of note disposed seriously to prefer the light to darkness, except Nicodemus; then he removes still further from the centre, and establishes Himself in the province. To this local retreat corresponds a modification in the character of His activity. He had presented Himself in the temple with full authority, as a sovereign who makes his entrance into his palace. That summons not having been accepted, Jesus cannot continue His Messianic activity; He restricts Himself to the work of prophetic preparation; He is obliged to become again, in some sort, His own forerunner, and by this retrogade step He finds Himself placed, for a moment, at the same point which John the Baptist had reached at the termination of his ministry. Hence the simultaneousness and the sort of competition which appeared between the two ministries and the two baptisms. After His return to Galilee, Jesus will Himself renounce this rite, and as the single element of Messianic organization He will only preserve the apostolate. He will no longer aim at anything except to awaken faith by the word. The foundation of the Church, with which the re-establishment of baptism is connected, will be deferred to the epoch when, by His death and resurrection, the bond between Him and the unbelieving people shall have been completely broken and the foundation of the new society prepared.

These changes in the mode of Jesus' activity have not escaped the notice of the rationalists; they have seen in them nothing else than the result of a growing miscalculation. Yet Jesus had announced all from the first day: "*Destroy this temple;*" and the final success of His work proves that there was something better here than the result of a deception. Faith, on

the contrary, admires, in this so varied course, the elasticity of the divine plan in its relations to human freedom, and the perfect submissiveness with which the Son can yield to the daily instructions of the Father. Thereby the absence of plan becomes the wisest and most wonderful of plans; and the divine wisdom, accepting the free play of human freedom, can make even the obstacles which the resistance of men opposes to it, the means of realizing its designs. This glance at the situation explains the momentary juxtaposition of these two ministries, the one of which, as it seemed, must succeed the other.

The following passage contains: 1. The general picture of the situation (vv. 22–26); 2. The discourse of John the Baptist (vv. 27–36).

1. Vv. 22–26.

Ver. 22. "*After this Jesus came with his disciples into the country of Judea; and he tarried there with them and baptized.*" Μετὰ ταῦτα (*after this*), connects this passage, in a general way, with ii. 23–25: "*Following upon* this activity of Jesus at Jerusalem." Ἰουδαία γῆ (*the land of Judea*), denotes the *country*, as opposed to the capital. The imperfect *he was tarrying*, and *he was baptizing*, indicate that this sojourn was of some duration. The expression, *he was baptizing*, is more exactly defined in iv. 2: "*Yet Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples.*" The moral act belonged to Jesus; the material operation was wrought by the disciples. If these two passages were found in two different Gospels, criticism would not fail immediately to see in them a contradiction, and would accuse of harmonistic bias the one who should seek to explain it. The intention of the narrator in our passage is only to place this baptism under the responsibility of Jesus Himself.

Ver. 23. "*Now John also was baptizing in Ænon, near to Salim, because there was abundance of water there; and they came and were baptized.*" *Æn*, from which *Ænon*, denotes a *fountain*. We may also, with *Meyer*, make of the termination *on* an abridgment of the word *jona, dove;* this word would thus signify *the fountain of the dove.* This locality was in the vicinity of a town called *Salim.* The situation of these two places is uncertain. *Eusebius* and *Jerome*, in the *Onomasticon*, place Ænon eight thousand paces south of Bethsean or Scythopolis, in the valley of the Jordan, on the borders of Samaria and Galilee, and Salim, a little further to the west. And indeed there has recently been found in these localities a ruin bearing the name of *Aynûn* (*Palestine Exploration Report*, 1874). From this, therefore, it would be necessary to conclude that these two localities were in Samaria. But this result is incompatible with the words of ver. 22: *in the country of Judea* (on the supposition, at least, that the two baptisms were near each other). And, above all, how should John have settled among the Samaritans? How could he have expected that the multitudes would follow him into the midst of this hostile people? *Ewald*, *Wieseler*, *Hengstenberg*, and *Mühlau*, because of these reasons, suppose an altogether different locality. In Josh. xv. 32 three towns are

spoken of: *Shilhim*, *Ain*, and *Rimmon*, situated towards the southern frontier of the tribe of Judah, on the borders of Edom (comp. xv. 21). In Josh. xix. 7 and 1 Chron. iv. 32, Ain and Rimmon again appear together. Finally, in Neh. xi. 29 these two names are blended in one: *En-Rimmon*. Might not Ænon be a still more complete contraction? This supposition would do away with the difficulty of the baptism in Samaria, and would give a very appropriate sense to the reason: *because there was abundance of water there*. Indeed, as applied to a region generally destitute of water and almost desert, like the southern extremity of Judah, this reason has greater force than if the question were of a country rich in water, like Samaria.

Jesus would thus have gone over all the territory of the tribe of Judah, seeing once in His life Bethlehem, His native town, Hebron, the city of Abraham and David, and all southern Judea even as far as Beersheba. This remark has excited the derisive humor of *Reuss;* we do not at all understand the reason of it. In the Synoptical Gospels, we see Jesus making a series of excursions as far as the northern limits of the Holy Land, once even to Cæsarea Philippi, in the vicinity of the ancient Dan, at the foot of Hermon, at another time as far as into the regions of Tyre and Sidon. He would thus have visited all the countries of the theocratic domain from Dan to Beersheba. Is not this altogether natural? *Hengstenberg* has taken advantage of this sojourn of Jesus in the vicinity of the desert, to place the temptation at this time. This opinion is chronologically untenable.

Ver. 24. "*For John had not yet been cast into prison.*" This remark of the evangelist is surprising, because there is nothing in what precedes which is adapted to occasion it. The fact of the incarceration of John the Baptist, as already accomplished, was not, in any way, implied in the preceding narrative. It is therefore elsewhere than in our Gospel that we must seek for the reason why the evangelist thinks that he must correct a misapprehension existing on this subject, as he evidently does by the remark of ver. 24. This reason is easily discovered in the narrative of our first two Synoptics: Matt. iv. 12: "*Jesus, having heard that John was delivered up, withdrew into Galilee.*" Mark i. 14: "*After that John was delivered up, Jesus came into Galilee.*" These words immediately follow the account of the baptism and temptation; they would necessarily produce on the reader the impression that the imprisonment of John the Baptist had followed very closely upon the baptism of Jesus, and preceded—even occasioned—His *first* return to Galilee; thus precisely the opinion which the remark of John sets aside. The account in Luke iii. 19, 20 is different; the imprisonment of the Baptist is there evidently mentioned only by way of anticipation. *Hengstenberg* thought that the narrative of Matthew and Mark might be explained by the fact that the first return of Jesus to Galilee—the one which John relates in i. 44—was simply omitted by them. But we have seen (ii. 11) that the first visit of Jesus to Capernaum coincided with certain scenes of the very first period of the Galilean ministry related by the Synoptics. It only remains, therefore, to acknowledge that frequently in the primitive oral tradition the first two re-

turns from Judea to Galilee (i. 44 and iv. 1–3) were blended together. From this identification would, naturally, result the suppression of the entire interval which had separated them—that is to say, of almost a whole year of Jesus' ministry. To recover this ground which had disappeared, John was thus obliged expressly to restore the distinction between the two returns. He was especially obliged to do this on reaching the fact which he is about to relate, a fact which falls precisely in this interval. *Hilgenfeld* himself, speaking of this passage, says: "Involuntarily the fourth evangelist bears witness here of his acquaintance with the Synoptical narrative." There is nothing to criticise in this remark except the word *involuntarily*. For the intentional character of this parenthesis, ver. 24, is obvious. We have already proved in John the evident intention of distinguishing these two returns to Galilee by the manner in which he spoke of the miracle of Cana, ii. 11; we shall have occasion to make a similar remark of the same character, with reference to iv. 54. As for the way in which this confusion arose in the tradition written out by the Synoptics, we may remember that it was only after the *second* return to Galilee that Jesus began that uninterrupted prophetic ministry which the first three Gospels portray for us very particularly and which was the beginning of the foundation of the Church. However important were the attempts made in Judea, up to this time, in the description of the development of Jewish unbelief which John traced, they could just as easily be omitted in the narrative of the actual establishment of the kingdom of God, and of the foundation of the Church which was the result of the Galilean ministry, related especially by the Synoptics.

We can draw from this twenty-fourth verse an important conclusion with respect to the position of the author of the fourth Gospel in the midst of the primitive Church. Who else but an apostle, but an apostle of the first rank, but an apostle recognized as such, could have taken in his writing a position so sovereign with regard to the tradition received in the Church, emanating from the Twelve, and recorded in the Gospels which were anterior to his own? By a stroke of the pen to introduce so considerable a modification in a narrative clothed with such authority, he must have been, and have felt himself to be, possessed of an authority which was altogether incontestable.

Ver. 25. "*There arose therefore a dispute on the part of John's disciples with a Jew*,[1] *touching purification*." The occasion of the following discourse was a discussion provoked by the competition of the two neighboring baptisms. Οὖν, *therefore*, marks this relation. The expression *on the part of the disciples*, shows that John's disciples were the instigators. The reading of the greater part of the Mjj. Ἰουδαίου, *a Jew*, instead of Ἰουδαίων, *some Jews*, is now generally preferred. I accept it, without being able to convince myself altogether of its authenticity. Should not the substantive Ἰουδαίου have been accompanied by the adjective τινός? And would an altercation

[1] The T. R. reads Ιουδαιων (*Jews*) with ℵ Mnn. It. Syr^{vss}. Cop. Orig. All the rest read Ιουδαιου (*a Jew*).

with a mere unknown individual have deserved to be so expressly marked? The three most ancient Versions agree in favor of the reading Ἰουδαίων, *Jews*. The Sinaitic MS. also reads in this way. The two substantives in ον, before and after this word, might have occasioned an error. The subject of the discussion was the true mode of purification. Of what purification? Evidently of that which should prepare the Jews for the kingdom of the Messiah. *Meyer* thinks that the Jew ascribed to the baptism of Jesus a greater efficacy than to that of John. *Chrysostom*, followed by some others, holds that the Jew had had himself baptized already by the disciples of Jesus. *Hofmann* and *Luthardt* suppose, on the contrary, because of the term *Jew*, that he belonged to the Pharisaic party, hostile both to Jesus and to John, and that he had maliciously recounted to the disciples of John the successes of Jesus. The use of this term scarcely allows us, indeed, to suppose in this man kindly feelings, either towards Jesus or towards John. Perhaps in response to the disciples of John who invited him to have himself baptized, reminding him of the promises of the Old Testament (Ezek. xxxvi. 25, etc.), he answered ironically that one knew not to whom to go: "Your master began; here is a second who succeeds better than he; which of the two says the truth?" The question was embarrassing. The disciples of John decide to submit it to their master. This historical situation is too well defined to have been invented.

Ver. 26. "*And they came to John and said to him: Master, he that was with thee beyond the Jordan, to whom thou hast borne witness, behold, he baptizeth, and all men come to him.*" There is something of bitterness in these words. The words: "*to whom thou hast borne witness*" make prominent the generosity which John had shown towards Jesus: "See there, how thou hast acted, thou (σύ); and see here, how He is acting, He (οὗτος). Ἴδε, *behold*, sets forth the unexpected character of such a course: "He baptizes, quite like thyself; thus, not content with asserting Himself, He seeks to set thee aside." Baptism was a special rite, introduced by John, and distinguishing his ministry from every other. By appropriating it to Himself, Jesus seemed to usurp the part peculiar to His predecessor and to desire to throw him altogether into the shade. And what is more poignant in this course of action is, that it succeeds: "*All men come to him.*" This exaggeration, *all*, is the result of spite. Matt. ix. 14 shows us John's disciples in Galilee, after the imprisonment of their master, animated by the same hostile disposition and combining more or less with the adversaries of Jesus.

2. Vv. 27–36.

John does not solve the difficulty raised by the Jew or the Jews. He goes directly to the foundation of things. After having characterized the relation between the two personages of whom it is desired to make rivals, he shows that all opposition, even all comparison between them, is out of place. The solution of the pending question follows of itself from this general explanation. The discourse has two parts which are very distinct

and the idea of which evidently answers to the given situation: "*I*" and "*He*," or, to use John's own expressions, the friend of the bridegroom (vv. 27–30), and the bridegroom (vv. 31–36). The first must be thrown into the shade and decrease; the second must increase. Each of the two, therefore, is in his place; that which grieves his disciples fills him with joy. It will be asked why the forerunner did not at that moment abandon his particular position, in order to go and join himself, with his disciples, to the retinue of Jesus. The answer to this question, often proposed, is not difficult. Summoned to prepare Israel for the kingdom of the Messiah, John was like the captain of a vessel, who must be the last to abandon the old ship, when all its company are already safely in the new one. His special part, officially marked out, continued so long as the end was not yet attained, that is, so long as the whole people were not yet given to Jesus.

Vv. 27–30. "*I.*"

Ver. 27. "*John answered and said: A man can receive nothing except that which hath been given him from heaven.*" As far as ver. 30, which is the centre of this discourse, the dominant idea is that of the person and mission of the forerunner. Accordingly, it seems natural to apply the general sentence of ver. 27 specially to John the Baptist. He is urged to defend himself against Jesus who is despoiling him. "I cannot take," he answers, "that which God has not given me"—in other words, "I cannot assign to myself my part: make myself the bridegroom, when I am only the friend of the bridegroom." So *Bengel, Lücke, Reuss, Hengstenberg*, I myself (first ed.). I abandoned this application in the second edition, for that of *Olshausen, de Wette, Meyer, Weiss*, according to which this maxim refers to Jesus: "He would not be obtaining such success, if God Himself did not give it to Him." With this meaning, this saying must be regarded as the summary of the two parts of the discourse (*I* and *He*), and not only of the first part. Yet I ask myself whether it is not proper, as I did originally, to refer this maxim to the *mission* conferred, rather than the *success* obtained; comp. Heb. v. 4. Then the asyndeton between vv. 26 and 27 is more consonant with the application to John only, since he announces the following verse as an energetic reaffirmation of the thought of ver. 26.

Ver. 28. "*Ye yourselves bear me*[1] *witness that I said: I am not the Christ, but I am sent before him.*" John expressly applies to himself the maxim of ver. 26. He has informed his disciples, from the beginning, of the fact of which they are complaining. He has always said to them, that it was not given to him to be the Christ, that his mission went no further than to open the way for Him. He appeals, with respect to this point, to their own recollection and discharges Himself thus from all responsibility for their jealous humor towards Jesus. The words: "*Ye bear me witness,*" seem to allude to their own expression, in ver. 26, where they had recalled

[1] The Mjj., ℵ E F H M V, and 60 Mnn. omit μοι (*me*).

the conduct of John with reference to Jesus. Then, he explains to them, by a comparison, the feeling which he experiences and which is so different from theirs.

Ver. 29. "*He that hath the bride is the bridegroom, and the friend of the bridegroom, who standeth and heareth*[1] *him, rejoiceth greatly because of the bridegroom's voice; this, my joy, therefore, is now perfect.*" His position is subordinate to that of Jesus, but it has also its privileges and its own joy, and that joy perfectly satisfies him. Νύμφη (the *bride*), is the Messianic community which John the Baptist was to form in Israel that he might lead it to Jesus; νύμφιος (the *bridegroom*), designates the Messiah, and, if we may so speak, the *betrothed* of this spiritual bride. The name Jehovah signifies precisely: *He who shall be* or *shall come*. According to the Old Testament, indeed, the Lord would not confide this part of bridegroom to any other than Himself, and the coming of the Messiah is to be the highest manifestation of Jehovah Himself (p. 276); comp. Is. liv. 5; Hos. ii. 19; Matt. ix. 15; xxv. 1 f.; Eph. v. 32; Apoc. xix. 7, etc. The functions of the marriage friend were, first, to ask the hand of the young woman, then to serve as an intermediary between the betrothed couple during the time of betrothal, and finally, to preside at the marriage-feast; a touching image of the part of John the Baptist: ὁ ἑστηκώς *he who standeth*. This word expresses, as *Hengstenberg* says, "the happy passivity" of him who beholds, listens and enjoys. While he fulfills his office in presence of the betrothed, the marriage-friend hears the noble and joyous accents of his friend, which transport him with joy. John speaks only of hearing, not of seeing. Why? Is it because he is himself removed from Jesus? But then, how can he even speak of *hearing?* If this term has a meaning applicable to John the Baptist, it implies that certain words of Jesus had been reported to him, and had filled his heart with joy and admiration. And how, indeed, could it have been otherwise? Could Andrew, Simon Peter, John, these former disciples of the Baptist, be in his neighborhood without coming to him, to give an account of all which they heard and saw? This is *the bridegroom's voice*, which causes the heart of his friend to leap for joy. The phrase, χαρᾷ χαίρειν (*to rejoice with joy*), corresponds to a Hebrew construction (the infinitive placed before the finite verb to strengthen the verbal idea); comp. שוש אשיש, Is. lxi. 10 (and the LXX); Luke xxii. 15. This expression describes the joy of John as a joy reaching to the full, and, consequently, as excluding every feeling of a different sort, such as that which the disciples were attempting to awaken in him. The words: *this joy which is mine*, contrast his joy as the marriage-*friend* to that of the *bridegroom*. John alludes to those words of the disciples: *all go to him;* in this spectacle is *his joy* as friend. Πεπλήρωται, not: *has been accomplished* (*Rilliet*), the aorist would be necessary, but: *is*, at this very moment, *raised to its highest point*. He means: "that which calls forth vexation in you is precisely the thing which fulfills my joy."

Ver. 30. "*He must increase, but I must decrease.*" Here is the expres-

[1] ℵ places αυτου after εστηκως.

sion which forms the connecting link between the two parts of the discourse, announcing the second and summing up the first. The friend of the bridegroom had, at the beginning of the relation, the principal part; it was he alone who appeared. But, in proportion as the relation develops itself, his part diminishes: he must disappear and leave the bridegroom to become *the sole person.* This is the position of John the Baptist; he accepts it, and desires no other. No one could have invented this admirable saying, a permanent motto of every true servant of Christ.

At this point, *Bengel*, *Tholuck*, *Olshausen* and others, make the discourse of the Baptist end, and the reflections of the evangelist begin. They rest principally on the Johannean character of the style in what follows, and on the reproduction of certain thoughts of the conversation with Nicodemus (see, especially, vv. 31, 32). To pronounce a decision, we must study the discourse even to the end. But, in itself, it would be scarcely natural that the words of ver. 30, *he must increase*, should not be developed in what follows, as the other words, *and I must decrease*, have been in what precedes.

Vv. 31–36. "*He.*"

The bridegroom, He must increase, while the friend decreases, for He is superior to him, first, through His origin (ver. 31), then, through the perfection of His teaching (vv. 32–34), finally, through His dignity as Son, and the absolute sovereignty which belongs to Him as such (ver. 35). The discourse closes with a practical conclusion (ver. 36).

Ver. 31. "*He that cometh from above is above all;*[1] *he that is of the earth,*[2] *is of the earth, and speaketh as being of the earth; he that cometh from heaven is above all.*"[3] With his own earthly nature John contrasts the heavenly origin of Jesus. Ἄνωθεν, *from above*, is applied here, not to the mission—for that of John is also from above—but to the *origin* of the person. The *all* denotes the divine agents in general. All, like John himself, are to be eclipsed by the Messiah. The words three times repeated: *of the earth*, forcibly express the sphere to which John belongs and beyond which he cannot go. The first time they refer to the origin (ὢν ἐκ): a mere man; the second, to the mode of existence (ἐστί): as being of the earth, he remains earthly in his whole manner of being, feeling and thinking (comp. the antithesis ver. 13); the third time, to the teaching (λαλεῖ): seeing the things of heaven only from beneath, from his earthly dwelling-place. This is true of John, even as a prophet. No doubt, in certain isolated moments and as if through partial openings, he catches a glimpse of the things from above; but even in his exstacies he speaks of God only as an earthly being. So, while inviting to repentance, he does not introduce into the kingdom. This estimate of John by himself is in harmony with the judgment of Jesus, Matt. xi. 11: "*The least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he.*" And the shaking of his faith, which followed so soon,

[1] ℵ D Italiq: και before ο ων.
[2] ℵ: επι instead of εκ; D: απο.
[3] ℵ D some Mnn. a b Syr^{cur}. omit επανω παντων εστι (*above all*) the second time.

was not long in demonstrating the justice of it. After having thus put in their proper place, as contrasted with Jesus, all the servants of heaven, John returns to the principal theme: *He.* If, with some of the Mjj., we reject the last words of this verse: *is above all,* the words *he that cometh from heaven* must be made the subject of the verb *bears witness,* ver. 32 (rejecting the καί). But the fullest and richest reading is also the one most accordant with the spirit of the text. By the last words, John returns to the real subject of this part of his discourse, Jesus, from which he had turned aside, for a moment, in order to make more prominent His superiority by the contrast with himself.

Ver. 32. "*What*[1] *he hath seen and heard, of that*[2] *he beareth witness; and no man receiveth his witness.*" The καί, *and,* is omitted by the Alexandrian authorities, and no doubt rightly; *asyndeta* are frequent in this discourse. From the heavenly origin of Jesus follows the perfection of His teaching. He is in *filial* communion with the Father. When He speaks of divine things, He speaks of them as an immediate witness. This saying is the echo of that of Jesus in ver. 11. In reproducing it, the forerunner declares that Jesus has affirmed nothing respecting Himself which is not the exact truth. But how could he know this? We think we have answered this question in the explanation of ver. 29. By the last words, John confirms the severe judgment which Jesus had passed upon the conduct of the people and their rulers (ver. 11). However, while declaring, as Jesus had done, the general unbelief of Israel, John does not deny individual exceptions; he brings them out expressly in ver. 33. What he means here by the word *no one,* is that these exceptions which seem so numerous to the view of his disciples that they make the whole ("*all*" ver. 26), are to his view only an imperceptible minority. To the exaggeration of envy, he opposes that of zeal: "Where you say: all, as for me, I say: no one." He would not be satisfied unless he saw the Sanhedrim in a body, followed by the whole people, coming to render homage to the bridegroom of the Messianic community. Then, he could, himself also, abandon his office as friend of the bridegroom, and come to sit, as spouse, at the Messiah's feet. We should notice the verbs in the present tense, "*he testifies* . . . no one *receives,*" which place us in the time of the ministry of Jesus, and do not permit us to put this part of the discourse in the evangelist's mouth.

Vv. 33, 34. "*He that hath received his testimony hath set his seal that God is true;* 34, *for he whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God; for he giveth*[3] *not the Spirit by measure.*" There are, nevertheless, some believers, and what is the grandeur and beauty of the part which they act! Σφραγίζειν, *to seal,* to legalise an act by affixing one's seal to it. This is what the believer does in relation to the testimony which Christ gives; in ranging himself among those who accept it, he has the honor of associating, once for all, his personal responsibility with that of God who speaks

[1] Και (*and*) is omitted by ℵ B D L T[b] It[aliq] Syr[cur] Cop. Orig.

[2] ℵ D omit τουτο.

[3] T. R. 15 Mjj. Syr. read, after διδωσιν, ὁ θεος (*God*) omitted by ℵ B C L T[b],

by His messenger. Indeed, this certification of truth, adjudged to Jesus by the believer, rises even to God Himself. This is what is explained by ver. 34 (*for*). The utterances of Jesus are to such a degree those of God, that to certify the truth of the former is to attest the veracity of God Himself. Some think that the idea of the divine veracity refers to the fulfillment of the prophecies which faith proclaims. But this idea has no connection with the context. According to others, John means that to believe in Jesus is to attest the truth of the declaration which God gave on His behalf at the time of His baptism. This sense would be natural enough in itself, but it does not accord well with ver. 34. The profound thought contained in this expression of John is the following: In receiving the utterances of Jesus with faith in their divine character, man boldly declares that what is divine cannot be false, and proclaims thus the incorruptible veracity of God. We must notice the aorist ἐσφράγισεν, *set his seal:* it is an accomplished act. And what an act! He affixes His private signature by his faith to the divine testimony, and becomes thus conjointly responsible for the veracity of God Himself. There is evidently somewhat of exaltation in this paradoxical form, by which John expresses the grandeur of the act of faith. The expression *whom he hath sent* (which recalls ver. 17), must be taken in the most absolute sense. The other divine messengers merit this name only in an inexact sense; they are, in reality, only raised up; to be sent, in the strict sense of the word, one must be from above (ver. 31). The same absolute force should be given to the expression: *the words of God:* He alone possesses the complete, absolute divine revelation. This is what the article τά, *the*, indicates; all others, John the Baptist himself, have only fragments of it. And whence comes this complete character of His revelation? From the fact that the communication which is made to Him of the Spirit is *without measure.* The T. R. reads, after δίδωσιν, ὁ θεός: "*God* gives the Spirit . . ." The Alexandrian authorities unanimously reject this subject, *God;* and it is probable that it is a gloss, but a gloss which is just to the sense. It is derived from the first clause of the verse. No doubt *the Spirit* might be made the subject, as I myself tried to do formerly. The position of the word τὸ πνεῦμα, *the Spirit*, however, is not favorable to this sense. And it is more simple to understand the subject of the preceding clause. The present δίδωσιν *gives*, as well as the expression: "not *by measure*," are explained by the recollection of the vision of the baptism: John saw the Spirit in the form of a dove, that is to say, in its living *totality*, descending *and abiding* upon Him. Meyer, offended by the ellipsis of the pronoun αὐτῷ, *to him*, makes a general maxim out of this saying, with the following sense: "God is not obliged always to give the Spirit, only in a definite measure, as He formerly did in the case of the prophets. He may, if He pleases, give it once without measure in its fullness," from which this application is understood: "And this is what He has done with respect to the Son." But thus precisely the thing would be understood which ought to be expressed, and expressed which might very well have been left to be understood. Perhaps, the ellipsis of the pronoun αὐτῷ, *to Him*, arises

from the fact that the gift of the Spirit to Jesus is in reality of a universal bearing. God does not give it *to* Him *for* Himself only, but for *all*. It is a permanent, absolute gift.

Ver. 35. "*The Father loveth the Son and hath given all things into his hand.*"—The *asyndeton* between this verse and the preceding may be rendered by this emphatic form: "Because also the Father loveth . . ." This absolute communication of the Spirit results from the incomparable love which the Father has for the Son. These words are, as it were, the echo of that divine declaration which John had heard at the baptism: "*This is my beloved Son.*" The term *ἀγαπᾷ, loves,* is taken in the absolute sense, like the expressions: *sent* and *the words*. Jesus had used the term *Son*, when speaking with Nicodemus, vv. 16–18; the second Psalm already applied it to the Messiah in vv. 7, 12 (where every other explanation seems to us untenable); Isaiah and Micah had expressed themselves in a similar way (Is. ix. 5; Micah v. 2, 3). John himself had heard it at the baptism. It is not surprising, therefore, that he uses it here. From this love of the Father flows the gift of *all things*. Some interpreters, starting from ver. 34, have applied this expression solely to spiritual gifts, to the powers of the Holy Spirit. But the expression *into His hand* does not accord with this sense. There is rather an advance upon the idea of ver. 34: "*Not only* the Spirit, but *all things.*" By the Spirit, the Son reigns in the heart of believers; this is not enough; the Father has, moreover, given Him universal sovereignty, that He may be able to make *all things* serve the good of His own. This is exactly the thought which Paul expresses in Eph. i. 22 by that untranslatable phrase: *αὐτὸν ἔδωκεν κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ.* The *hand* is the symbol of free disposal. Thereby John meant to say: "I complain of being despoiled by Him! But He has a right to everything and can take everything without encroachment." And from this follows the striking application which he makes to his disciples, in closing, of the truth which he has just proclaimed:

Ver. 36. "*He that believeth on the Son hath eternal life; but he that obeyeth not the Son shall not see*[1] *life, but the wrath of God abideth on him.*" This is the practical consequence to be drawn from the supreme greatness of the Son. These last words present a great similarity to the close of Ps. ii: "*Do reverence to the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish in the way when, in a little time, his wrath will be kindled; but blessed are they that put their trust in him.*" Only John, the reverse of the Psalmist and of Jesus Himself (iii. 19–21), begins with believers, to end with unbelievers. It is because he would give a stern and last warning to his disciples and the entire nation. John declares, as Jesus had said to Nicodemus, that all depends for every man on faith and unbelief, and that the absolute value of these two moral facts arises from the supreme dignity of Him who is the object of them: the Son. This name is sufficient to explain why faith gives life, why unbelief brings wrath. The phrase *ὁ ἀπειθῶν, he who disobeys,* brings out the voluntary side in unbelief, that of revolt. The Son is the legitimate sovereign; unbelief is the refusal to submit. The words: *the wrath abides,*

[1] ℵ reads ουκ εχει (*hath not*), instead of ουκ οψεται (*shall not see*).

have often been understood in this sense: The *natural* condemnation abides, because the act which alone could have removed it, that of faith, has not taken place. But this sense seems to us weak and strained, and is only imperfectly connected with what precedes. The question is rather of the wrath called forth by the very refusal of obedience, and falling upon the unbeliever *as such*. Is it not just that God should be angry? If faith seals the veracity of God (ver. 33), unbelief *makes God a liar* (1 John v. 10).—The future *shall see* is opposed to the present *has*. Not only does he not have life now, but when it shall be outwardly revealed in its perfect form—that of glory—he shall not behold it; it shall be for him as though it were not. Here is a word which shows clearly that the ordinary eschatology is by no means foreign to the fourth Gospel. The verb μενει, *abides*, in spite of its correlation with the future ὄψεται, *shall see*, is a present, and should be written μένει. The present *abides* expresses, much better than the future *shall abide*, the notion of permanence. All other wrath is revocable; that which befalls unbelief abides forever. Thus the epithet *eternal* of the first clause has its counterpart in the second.

Respecting the fact which we have just been studying, the following is *Renan's* judgment: "The twenty-second and following verses, as far as ver. 2 of chap. iv., transport us into what is thoroughly historical. . . . This is extremely remarkable. The Synoptics have nothing like it" (p. 491).—As to the *discourse*, it may be called: the last word of the Old Covenant. It recalls that threatening of Malachi which closes the Old Testament: "*Lest I come and smite the earth with a curse.*" It accords thus with the given situation: In view of the unbelief which was emphatically manifested even among his disciples, the forerunner completes his previous calls to faith by a menacing warning. All the details of the discourse are in harmony with the character of the person of the Baptist. There is not a word which cannot be fully explained in his mouth. Vv. 27, 29, 30 have a seal of inimitable originality; no other than the forerunner, in his unique situation, would have been able to create them. Ver. 35 is simply the echo of the divine declaration which he had himself heard at the moment of the baptism. In ver. 34 there is formulated no less simply the entire content of the vision which was beheld at that same moment. Ver. 28 is the reproduction of his own testimony in the Synoptics (Matt. iii. and parallels). Ver. 36 also recalls his former preachings on the *wrath to come* (Matt. iii. 7) and that *axe already laid unto the root of the trees* (iii. 10) with which he had threatened Israel. There remain only vv. 31, 32. We believe we have indicated the very probable origin of these verses (see on ver. 32). Will any one find an objection in the Johannean coloring of the style? But we must recall to mind the fact that we have here the Greek reproduction by the evangelist's pen of a discourse given in Aramaic (see Introd. pp. 172–175). It is entirely impossible to imagine a writer of a later epoch carrying himself back thus into the midst of the facts, drawing all the words from the given situation, and, above all, adapting to it with so much precision the progress of the discourse (John and Jesus), and binding together the two parts of it by the admirable saying of ver. 30. *Weizsäcker* himself cannot refrain from acknowledging (p. 268) "that there are in this discourse elements of detail which distinctly mark the Baptist's own point of view" (vv. 27, 34, 35, 36).

We have already replied to the objection derived from the special and independent position which John the Baptist keeps, instead of going to rank himself among the disciples of Jesus. As long as the aim of his mission—to lead Israel to Jesus,—was so far from being attained, that preparatory mission continued, and the Baptist was not free to exchange it for the position of a disciple which would have been more satisfactory to him (ver. 29). It is asked how, after such a discourse of their Master, John's disciples could have subsequently formed themselves into an anti-Christian sect? But a small number from among the innumerable multitude of those baptized by John were present at this scene, and it would, in truth, be much to expect of a discourse—to suppose that it could have extirpated a feeling of jealousy which was so deep that we even find the traces of it again in the Synoptics (Matt. ix. 14 and parallels). On the point in Matt. xi. 2, also alleged in opposition to the authenticity of this discourse, see on i. 34.

Weiss holds, like *Reuss*, that this discourse contains authentic elements, but worked over by the evangelist, and that he has fused them into one whole with his own ideas. Thus, he proves the authenticity of the saying of ver. 34 by this argument: The perfection of Jesus' teaching is here ascribed by the forerunner to the action of the Holy Spirit, while John the Evangelist ascribes it to the remembrance which He had of His knowledge of the Father in His pre-existent state. This difference between the idea of the evangelist and that of the Baptist must prove the historical character of the discourse, at least in this point. But we have seen hitherto and we shall continue to discover that this way of conceiving of the higher knowledge of Jesus, which Weiss attributes to the evangelist, is by no means in harmony with the text and with the thought of our fourth Gospel. This alleged difference between his conception and that of the Baptist does not exist.

Our Gospel does not give an account of the imprisonment of John the Baptist. But the saying of Jesus (v. 35) implies the disappearance of the forerunner. This took place, therefore, very shortly after this last testimony uttered by him in Judea (see at iv. 1). The fact of John's death was omitted here, like so many other facts with which the author knows that his readers are well acquainted, and the mention of which does not fall within his plan.

I cannot believe (see p. 258) that the account which occupies our attention was written without some allusion to the disciples of John, who were moving about in considerable numbers in Asia Minor; not, surely, that I would wish to claim, that the entire fourth Gospel owes its existence to this polemical design, but it has entered as a factor into its composition (comp. Introd., pp. 213, 214).

SECOND SECTION.

IV. 1–42.

Jesus in Samaria.

The first phase of the public ministry of Jesus is ended. Unbelief on the part of the masses, faith on the part of a few, public attention greatly aroused, such is the result of His work in Judea. Nevertheless the uneasiness which He sees appearing among the leaders of the people with relation to Himself, is for Him the signal for retreat. He does not wish

to engage prematurely in a conflict which He knows to be inevitable. He abandons Judea therefore to His enemies and, returning to Galilee, He makes that retired province, from this time onward, the ordinary theatre of His activity.

The direct road from Judea to Galilee passed through Samaria. But was it the one which was followed by the Jews, for example the Galilean caravans which went to the feasts at Jerusalem? Writers ordinarily answer in the affirmative, resting upon the passage of Josephus *Antiq.* vi. 1: "It was the custom of the Galilæans to pass through Samaria in order to go to the feasts at Jerusalem." But *R. Steck*[1] has concluded, not without reason, from a passage in the *Life of Josephus* (chap. 52): "Those who wish to go quickly from Galilee to Jerusalem must pass through Samaria," that the custom of which that author speaks in the *Antiquities* was not so general as the first passage seems to imply. Perhaps this road was that of the festival caravans; but it was not that of the Jews who were of strict observance, at least in private life. As to Jesus it has been claimed that by following this road in this case, He would have put Himself in contradiction to His own word in Matt. x. 5, where, on sending them out to preach, He said to the apostles: "*Go not into the way of the Gentiles and enter not into any city of the Samaritans; but go ye rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.*" But, between *passing through Samaria* (διὰ τῆς Σαμαρ., ver. 4) and making the Samaritan people the object of a mission, there is an easily appreciable difference. We should much rather acknowledge, with Hengstenberg, that it might be befitting for Jesus to give once, during His earthly life, an example of largeness of heart to His apostles which might afterwards direct the Christian mission throughout the whole world. Luke ix. 51 proves that Jesus really did not fear to approach the Samaritan soil.

The fact which is to follow has a typical significance. Jesus Himself acutely feels it (ver. 38). This Samaritan woman and these inhabitants of Sychar, by the readiness and earnestness of their faith, and by the contrast of their conduct with that of the Israelitish people, become in His eyes the first-fruits, as it were, of the conversion of the Gentile world. There is therein a sign for Him of the future destiny of the kingdom of God on earth. Must we from this conclude, with *Baur*, that this whole account is only an *idea* presented in action by the author of our Gospel? Certainly not. If the Samaritan woman was nothing but a personification of the Gentile world, how would the author have put into her mouth (ver. 20 f.) a strictly monotheistic profession of faith, as well as the hope of the near advent of the Messiah (ver. 25; comp. ver. 42)? Because a fact has an ideal and prophetic significance, it does not follow that it is fictitious. If there is a story of the Saviour's life which, by reason of the vivacity and freshness of its totality and its details, bears the seal of historic truth, it is this. *Renan* himself says: "Most of the circumstances of the narrative bear a strikingly impressive stamp of truth." (*Vie de Jésus*, p. 243.)

[1] *Jahrb. f. prot. Theol.*, 1880, IV., (Der Pilgerweg der Galiläer nach Jerusalem).

As an example of faith, this incident is connected with the two preceding representations: that of the faith of the apostles (i. 38 ff.) and that of the visit of Nicodemus (iii. i.–21). These are the luminous parts of the narrative which alternate with the sombre parts, representing the beginning of unbelief (i. 19 ff.; ii. 12 ff.; iii. 25 ff.).

We distinguish in this narrative the following three phases: 1. Jesus and the Samaritan woman: vv. 1–26; 2. Jesus and the disciples: vv. 27–38; 3. Jesus and the Samaritans: vv. 39–42.

I.—*Jesus and the Samaritan Woman:* vv. 1–26.

In this first phase we see how Jesus succeeds in awaking faith in a soul which was a stranger to all spiritual life. The historical situation is described in vv. 1–6.

Vv. 1–3. "*When therefore the Lord*[1] *knew that the Pharisees had heard that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than*[2] *John,—2, though Jesus did not himself baptize, but his disciples,—3, he left Judea, and departed again*[3] *into Galilee.*" Ver. 1. explains the motive which leads Jesus to leave Judea: A report has reached the Pharisees respecting Him, according to which this new personage may become more formidable than John himself. Οὖν, *therefore:* because of this great concourse of people, mentioned in iii. 23–26. The title: *the Lord* (in the larger part of the MSS.), is but rarely applied to Jesus during His earthly life (vi. 23; xi. 2). It pre-supposes the habit of representing Jesus to the mind as raised to glory. It is frequent in the epistles. If it is authentic in this passage (see the various reading of three MSS., which read: *Jesus*), it is occasioned either by the feeling of the divine greatness of Jesus, which manifests itself in the preceding section, or, more simply, by the desire of avoiding the repetition of the name of Jesus, which occurs again a few words further on. The expression *had heard* excludes a supernatural knowledge. We see in what follows that the tenor of the report made at Jerusalem is *textually* reproduced; comp. the name of Jesus instead of the pronoun *He*, and the present tenses ποιεῖ and βαπτίζει, *makes* and *baptizes*. Jesus must have appeared more dangerous than John, first, because of the Messianic testimony which John had borne to Him, and, then, because of His course of action which was much more independent of legal and Pharisaic forms; finally, because of His miracles; with relation to John, comp. x. 41. The reading of the five Mjj., which omit ἤ, *than*, could only have this meaning: "that the Pharisees had heard that Jesus is making more disciples, and *that* (on his side) John is baptizing." This meaning is strange, and even absurd. The term *disciples*, which here denotes the baptized, will be found again in vii. 3 in this special sense.

The practical conclusion which Jesus draws from this report may lead

[1] ℵ Δ Λ some Mnn. It^{plerique} Vg. Syr. Cop. read ὁ Ἰησους (*Jesus*) instead of ὁ κυριος (*the Lord*).

[2] A B G L Γ reject ἤ (*than*).

[3] Παλιν (*again*) is found in ℵ C D L M T^{b} some Mnn. It^{plerique} Vg. Cop. Syr^{sch}. It is omitted by all the other documents.

us to suppose that John had been already arrested and that, as *Hengstenberg* thinks, the Pharisees had played a part in this imprisonment; comp. the term παρεδόθη, *was delivered up*, Matt. iv. 12; it was, he says, by the hands of the Pharisees, that John had fallen under the power of Herod. But it will be asked why Jesus retires into Galilee, into the domain of Herod; was not this running in the face of danger? No; for this prince's hatred to John was a personal matter. As to His religious activity, Jesus had less hindrance to fear on the part of Herod than on that of the dominant party in Judea.

The remark of ver. 2 is designed to give precision to the indefinite expression used by the evangelist himself, iii. 22: that *Jesus is baptizing*. Nothing is indifferent in the Lord's mode of acting, and John does not wish to allow a false idea to be formed by his readers, respecting one of His acts. Why did Jesus baptize, and that without Himself baptizing? By baptizing, He attested the unity of His work with that of the forerunner. By not Himself baptizing, He made the superiority of His position above that of John the Baptist to be felt. He recalled to mind that which the latter had said: "I baptize you with water, there cometh another who will baptize you with the Spirit and with fire," and reserved expressly for Himself that higher baptism. The first of these observations makes us understand why, at the end of a certain time, He discontinued the baptism of water, and the second, why He re-established it later as a type of the baptism of the Spirit which was to come. At all events, we must not compare this course of action with that of Paul (1 Cor. i. 17) and of Peter (Acts x. 48), which had quite another aim. If He gave up this rite in the interval, this fact stands in relation to that other: that Jesus ceased taking a Messianic position in Galilee, to content Himself with the part of a prophet, up to the moment when He presented Himself again in Judea as the Son of David and the promised Messiah (chap. xii.). At the same time, He gave up transforming into a Messianic community, by means of baptism, that Israel whose unbelief emphatically manifested itself towards Him. There are therefore three degrees in the institution of baptism: 1. The baptism of John: a preparation for the Messianic kingdom by repentance; 2. The baptism of Jesus, at the beginning of His ministry: a sign of attachment to the person of the Messiah, with the character of disciples; 3. The baptism re-instituted by Jesus after His resurrection: a consecration to the baptism of the Spirit. Those who had received the first of these three baptisms (e. g. the apostles) do not seem to have submitted afterwards to the second or third. Jesus made use of them to administer these two latter baptisms (ver. 2; Acts ii.). It is not without reason that *Beck* has compared the baptism of infants in the Christian Church with the second of these three baptisms.

The departure from Judea is pointed out, ver. 3, as a distinct act of *return* to Galilee; and this because, according to ver. 1, the real object of Jesus was much less to go thither than to depart thence. The word πάλιν, *again*, which is read by six Mjj., alludes to a previous return to Galilee (i. 44). John avails himself of each occasion to distinguish these two returns

which had been identified by the Synoptic tradition (see on iii. 24). This adverb is, therefore, authentic, notwithstanding the numerous MSS. and critics that omit it or reject it.

Vv. 4, 5. "*Now he must needs pass through Samaria. He cometh thus to a city of Samaria called Sychar,*[1] *near to the parcel of ground which Jacob gave to his son Joseph.*" Ἔδει, *it was necessary:* if one would not, like the very strict Jews, purposely avoid this polluted country (comp. p. 416); Jesus did not share this particularistic spirit. The name *Sychar* is surprising; for the only city known in this locality is that which bears the name of *Shechem*, and which is so frequently mentioned in the Old Testament. Can there be an error here of a writer who was a stranger to Palestine, as the adversaries of the authenticity of our Gospel claim? We think the solutions scarcely probable which make the name Sychar a popular and intentional corruption of that of Shechem, deriving it either from *Schéker, falsehood* (city of falsehood, that is to say, of heathenism), or from Schékar, *liquor* (city of drunkards; comp. Is. xxviii. 1, *the drunkards of Ephraim*). We might rather hold an involuntary transformation through an interchange of liquid letters which was frequent (as e. g. that of *bar* for *ben, son*). But the most natural solution is that which is offered by the passages of Eusebius and Jerome, in which two neighboring localities bearing these two distinct names are positively distinguished. Eusebius says in the *Onomasticon:* "Sychar *before* Neapolis." Neapolis, indeed, is nothing else then the modern name of Shechem. The Talmud speaks also of a locality called *Soukar*, of a *spring* Soukar, of the *plain* of Soukar. At the present day also, a hamlet exists very near Jacob's well and situated at the foot of Mount Ebal, which bears the name *El-Ascar*, a name which very much resembles the one which we read in John and in the Talmud. *Lieut. Conder* and *M. Socin*[2] also give their assent to this view. It seems certain, moreover, that the ancient Shechem was situated somewhat more to the east than the present city of Nablous. This is proved by the ruins which are discovered everywhere between Nablous and Jacob's well (see Félix Bovet, *Voyage en Terre-Sainte*, p. 363). Petermann (art. *Samaria* in Herzog's *Encyclop.* xiii. p. 362) says: "The emperor Vespasian considerably enlarged the city on the western side." In any case, to see, with *Furrer*, in this name Sychar an indication of the purely ideal character of the account, one must be thoroughly preoccupied by a preconceived theory (*Bibellex.*, iii., p. 375). It is at Nablous that the remnant of the Samaritan people who are reduced to the number of about one hundred and thirty persons live at the present day.

According to *de Wette, Meyer*, and others, the gift of Jacob to Joseph, mentioned in this fifth verse, rests on a false tradition, even arising from a misunderstanding of the LXX. Gen. xlviii. 22, Jacob says to Joseph: "*I give thee one portion* (Schekem), *above thy brethren, which I took from the Amorites with my sword and my bow.*" As the patriarch has just adopted as

[1] All the MSS., with the exception of some Mnn., and all the ancient Versions read Συχαρ and not Σιχαρ.

[2] *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins*, I. Heft. p. 42.

his own the two children of Joseph, it is natural for him to assign to this son *one portion above all his brethren*. But the Hebrew word (*Schekem*) which denotes a portion of territory (strictly *shoulder*) is at the same time the name of the city, Shechem; and it is claimed that the LXX., taking this word in the geographical sense (as the name of a city), gave rise, through this false translation, to the popular legend which we find here, and according to which Jacob left Shechem as a legacy to Joseph. But it is incontestable that when Jacob speaks "of the portion of country which he had taken from the Amorites *with his bow and his sword*," he alludes to the bloody exploit of his two sons, Simeon and Levi, against the city of Shechem (Gen. xxxiv. 25–27): "*Having taken their sword, they entered the city of Shechem, and slew all its inhabitants and utterly spoiled it.*" This is the only martial act mentioned in the history of the patriarch. Notwithstanding its reprehensible character, Jacob appropriates it to himself in these words, as a confirmation of the purchase which he had himself previously made (Gen. xxxiii. 19) of a domain in this district of Shechem, and he sees therein, as it were, the pledge of the future conquest of this whole country by his descendants. Thus, then, by using in order to designate the *portion* which he gives to Joseph, the word *schekem*, it is the patriarch who makes a play upon words, such as is found so frequently in the Old Testament; he leaves to him a portion (*Schekem*) which is nothing else than *Shechem*. His sons so well understood his thought, that, when their descendants returned to Canaan, their first care was to lay the bones of Joseph in Jacob's field near to Shechem (Josh. xxiv. 32), then to assign, as a *portion*, to the larger of the two tribes descended from Joseph, that of Ephraim, the country in which *Shechem* was located. The LXX. not being able to render the play upon words in Greek, translated the word *schekem* in the geographical sense; for it was the one which had most significance. There is here, therefore, neither a false translation on their part, nor a false tradition taken up by the evangelist.

Ver. 6. "*Jacob's well was there; Jesus therefore, wearied by his journey, sat thus*[1] *by the well; it was about the sixth hour.*" This well still exists; for "it is probably the same which is now called *Bir-Jakoub*" (*Renan, Vie de Jésus*, p. 243). It is situated thirty-five minutes eastward of Nablous, precisely at the place where the road which follows the principal valley, that of Mukhna, from south to north, turns suddenly to the west, to enter the narrow valley of Shechem, with Ebal on the northeast and Gerizim on the southwest. The well is hollowed out, not in the rock, as is commonly said, but rather, according to Lieutenant Anderson, who descended into it in 1866, in alluvial ground; the same person has ascertained that the sides are for this reason lined with rude masonry. It is nine feet in diameter. In March, 1694, Maundrell found the depth to be one hundred and five feet. In 1843, according to Wilson, it was only seventy-five feet, owing, doubtless, to the falling in of the earth. Maundrell found in it fifteen feet of water. So also Anderson, in May, 1866. Robinson and

[1] Ουτως (*thus*), is omitted by some Mnn.; Itala, and Syr.

Bovet found it dry. Schubert, in the month of April, was able to drink of its water. Tristram, in December, found only the bottom wet, while, in February, he found it full of water. At the present day, it is blocked up with large stones, five or six feet below the aperture; but the real opening is found several feet lower. A few minutes further to the north, towards the hamlet of Askar, the tomb of Joseph is pointed out. Robinson asks with what object this gigantic work could have been undertaken in a country so abounding in springs—as many as eighty are counted in Nablous and its environs. There is no other answer to give but that of Hengstenberg: "This work is that of a man who, a stranger in the country, wished to live independently of the inhabitants to whom the springs belonged, and to leave a monument of his right of property in this soil and in this whole country. Thus the very nature of this work fully confirms the origin which is assigned to it by tradition."

The caravan, leaving the great plain which stretches towards the north, directed its course to the left, in order to enter the valley of Shechem. There Jesus seated Himself near the well, leaving His disciples to continue their journey as far as Sychar, where they were to procure provisions. He was oppressed by fatigue, κεκοπιακώς (*wearied*), says the evangelist; and the Tübingen school ascribes to John the opinion of the Docetæ, according to which the body of Jesus was only an appearance! Οὕτως (*thus*), is almost untranslatable in our language; it is doubtless for some such reason that it is omitted in the Latin and Syriac versions. It signifies: without further preparation; taking things as He found them. According to the meaning given by *Erasmus*, *Beza*, etc., "wearied *as He was*," the adverb would rather have been placed before the verb; comp. Acts. xx. 11; xxvii. 17 (*Meyer*). The imperfect (ἐκαθέζετο), is descriptive; it does not mean: *He seated Himself*, but: *He was seated;* (comp. xi. 20; xx. 12; Luke ii. 46, etc.). The word refers not to what precedes, but to what follows. "He *was there seated* when a woman came . . . " The *sixth hour* must denote mid-day, according to the mode of reckoning generally received at that time in the East (see at i. 40). This hour of the day suits the context better than six o'clock in the morning or evening. Jesus was oppressed at once by the journey and the heat. The first part of the conversation extends as far as ver. 15; it is immediately connected with the situation which is given.

Vv. 7–9. "*A woman of Samaria comes to draw water. Jesus says to her: Give me to drink.* 8. *For his disciples had gone to the city to buy food.* 9. *The Samaritan woman therefore says to him: How is it that thou, being a Jew, dost ask drink of me who am a Samaritan woman.* (*For the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans.*"[1]) How was it that this woman came so far to seek water, and at such an hour? She had undoubtedly been working in the fields, and was coming to draw water on her return to her home at the hour of dinner (see at ver. 15). It has been thought that this feature suits an evening hour better, since that is ordinarily the hour when the women go to the well. But in that case this woman would undoubtedly not have been found here alone (*Meyer*, *Weiss*).

[1] This paronthesis is wholly omitted by ℵ.

The objective phrase: *of Samaria*, depends on the word *woman*, and not on the verb *comes;* for, in the latter case, Samaria would mean the city of that name; an impossible meaning, since that city was situated three leagues to the northeast. The request of Jesus must be understood in the most simple sense, and regarded as serious. There is no allegory in it; He is really thirsty; this follows from the word *wearied.* But this does not prevent Him, in beginning a conversation with the woman, from obeying another necessity than that of thirst—namely, of saving (vv. 32, 34). He is not unaware that the way to gain a soul is often to ask a service of it; there is thus conceded to it a kind of superiority which flatters it. "The effect of this little word was great; it began to overturn the wall which had for ages separated the two peoples," says *Lange.* The remark of ver. 8 is intended to explain that, if the disciples had been present, they would have had a vessel, an ἀντλημα, to let down into the well. Indeed, in the East, every caravan is provided with a bucket for drawing from the wells which appear on the road (see ver. 11). This explanation given by the evangelist, proves the complete reality, in his view, of the need which called forth the request of Jesus. There is no longer here anything of docetism! Does the expression, *the disciples*, denote all the disciples without exception? Might not one of them, John, for example, have remained with Jesus? It would be strange enough that Jesus should have been left there, absolutely alone, in the midst of a hostile population; and twelve men were not necessary to procure provisions! *Meyer's* prudery is offended at such a simple supposition, and *Reuss* goes so far as to say: "The luminous idea has been formed of leaving John at the place to take notes."—The Jewish doctors said: "He who eats bread with a Samaritan is as he who eats swine's flesh." This prohibition, however, was not absolute; it did not apply either to fruits or to vegetables. As to corn and wine, we are ignorant. Uncooked eggs were allowed; whether cooked, was a question (*Hausrath, Neutest. Zeitgesch.*, I., p. 22). It is proved, however, that the most strict Rabbinical regulations belong to a later epoch.

How did the Samaritan woman recognize Jesus as a Jew. By His dress or His accent? *Stier* has observed that in some words which Jesus had just spoken the letter ש occurred, which, according to Judg. xii. 6, distinguished the two pronunciations, the Jewish (*sch*), and the Samaritan (*s*); תני לשחת (*teni lischechoth;* Samaritan: *lisechoth*).—The last words (οὐ γὰρ συγχρῶνται) are a remark of the evangelist, with a view to his Gentile readers who might be unacquainted with the origin of the Samaritan people (2 Kings xvii. 24 ff.). It was a mixture of five nations transported from the East by Esarhaddon to re-people the kingdom of Samaria, the inhabitants of which his predecessor had removed. To the worship of their national gods, they united that of the divinity of the country, Jehovah. After the return from the Babylonish captivity, they offered the Jews their services for the rebuilding of the temple. Being rejected, they used all their influence with the kings of Persia, to hinder the re-establishment of the Jewish people. They built for themselves a temple on Mount Geri-

zim. Their first priest was Manasseh, a Jewish priest who had married a Persian wife. They were more detested by the Jews than the Gentiles themselves were. Samaritan proselytes were not received. It has been thought that the woman, in frolicsomeness, exaggerated somewhat the consequences of the hostility between the two peoples, and that in submitting to Jesus this insignificant question, she wished to enjoy for a moment the superiority which her position gave her. This shade of thought does not appear from the text. The Samaritan woman *naively* expresses her surprise.

Ver. 10. "*Jesus answered and said unto her: If thou knewest the gift of God and who it is who says unto thee: Give me to drink, thou wouldst have asked of him thyself, and he would have given thee living water.*" To this observation of the woman Jesus replies, not by renewing His request, but by making her an offer by means of which He reassumes His position of superiority. To this end, it is enough to raise this woman's thoughts to the spiritual sphere, where there is no more anything for Him but to give, and for her but to receive. The expression: *The gift of God*, may be regarded as an abstract notion, whose concrete reality is indicated by the following words: *who it is that says to thee* (so in our first edition). The words of Jesus in iii. 16: "*God so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son*," favor this sense, according to which Jesus is Himself the gift of God. But as Jesus distinguishes Himself from the living water, in the following words, it is better to see in the words: *He who says to thee*, the agent through whom God makes this gift to the human soul. God gives Jesus to the world, and Jesus gives to it the living water. *Living water*, in the literal sense, denotes spring-water, in contrast with water of a cistern, or stagnant water. Gen. xxvi. 19: "*Israel's servants dug in the valley, and found there a well of living water*," that is, a subterranean spring of which they made a well; comp. Levit. xiv. 5. In the figurative sense, living water is, therefore, a blessing which has the property of incessantly reproducing itself, like a gushing spring, like life itself, and which consequently is never exhausted. What does Jesus mean by this? According to *Justin* and *Cyprian*, baptism; according to *Lücke*, faith; according to *Olshausen*, Jesus Himself; according to *Calvin*, *Luthardt*, *Keil*, the Holy Spirit; according to *Grotius*, the evangelical doctrine; according to *Meyer*, truth; according to *Tholuck*, *Weiss*, the word of salvation; according to *Westcott*, eternal life, consisting in the knowledge of God and of His Son Jesus Christ (xvii. 3); this scholar cites as analogous the Rabbinical proverb: "When the prophets speak of water, they mean the law." *Lange*, according to ver. 14: The interior life, especially with reference to peace in the heart. It seems to me that, according to Jesus Himself (vv. 13, 14), it is, as Westcott thinks, eternal life, salvation, the full satisfaction of all the wants of the heart and the possession of all the holy energies of which the soul is susceptible. This state of soundness of the soul can only be the result of the dwelling of Jesus Himself in the heart, by means of His word made inwardly living by the Holy Spirit (chaps. xiv.–xvi.). This explanation includes, therefore, all the others up to a certain point.

Vv. 11, 12. "*The woman*[1] *says to him: Sir, thou hast nothing to draw with, and the well is deep; from whence, then,*[2] *hast thou that living water?* 12. *Art thou greater than our father Jacob, who gave us the well, and who drank of it himself, as well as his sons and his cattle?*" The Samaritan woman takes the expression *living water* in its literal sense. She means: "Thou canst *neither* (οὔτε) draw from the well the living water which thou offerest to me—for thou hast no vessel to draw with—*nor* (καί), because of its depth, canst thou reach by any other means the spring which feeds it." Unable to suppose that He is speaking spiritually, she cannot understand that He offers her what He has Himself asked from her (*Westcott*). The term κύριε, Sir, expresses, however, profound respect. She calls Jacob *our father*, because the Samaritans claimed descent from Ephraim and Manasseh (Joseph. *Antiqq.* ix. 14, 3). Θρέμματα: servants and cattle, everything requiring to be supported. It is the complete picture of patriarchal nomad life which appears here.

Vv. 13, 14. "*Jesus answered and said to her: Whoever drinks of this water shall thirst again; but he that shall drink*[3] *of the water that I shall give him, shall never thirst; but the water that I*[4] *shall give him*[4] *shall become in him a fountain of water springing up unto eternal life.*" It is to no purpose that the water of the well is spring-water; it is not that which Jesus means by living water; it has not the power of reproducing itself in him who drinks it; so, after a certain time, the want revives and the torment of thirst makes itself felt. "A beautiful inscription," says Stier, "to be placed upon fountains." Such water presents itself to the thought of Jesus as the emblem of all earthly satisfactions, after which the want reappears in the soul and puts it again in dependence upon external objects in order to its satisfaction.

Jesus defines in ver. 14 the nature of the true living water; it is that which, reproducing itself within by its own potentiality, quenches the soul's want as it arises, so that the heart cannot suffer a single moment of inward torment of thirst. Man possesses in himself a satisfaction independent of earthly objects and conditions.—Ἐγώ; yes, *I*, (in opposition to Jacob).—With *Reuss*, I formerly referred the words εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, *unto eternal life*, not to time, but to the effect produced, to the *mode* of appearance: in the form of eternal life. The parallel term, however, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα *for ever*, favors rather the temporal sense, "*even to the life without end.*"

Ver. 15. "*The woman says to him: Sir, give me this water, that I may not thirst, neither pass this way*[5] *to draw.*"—This woman's request has certainly a serious side. The respectful address, *Sir*, is sufficient to prove this. It follows likewise from the grave character of the answer of Jesus. Even though the absence of spiritual wants causes her not to understand, she is

[1] B rejects η γυνη. ℵ reads εκεινη.

[2] ℵ D Syr., omit ουν.

[3] ℵ D read ο δε πινων, instead of ος δ' αν πιη.

[4] ℵ D M, some Mnn., and It., read εγω before δωσω. ℵ rejects αυτω which follows this same word.

[5] Instead of ερχομαι or ερχωμαι, between which the other three Mjj. are divided, ℵ reads διερχωμαι, B διερχομαι.

impressed; can this man indeed have the power of working such a miracle? Nevertheless, the expression of the desire which she experiences to have her life made more comfortable has in it something *naive* and almost humorous. —The last words reproduce the promise of Jesus: "shall not thirst." The reading of the two oldest MSS.: "that I *pass* no more this way," instead of: *that I come hither no more*, should undoubtedly be adopted. No one would have substituted this for the received reading. It confirms the idea that we have expressed: namely, that the woman was merely *passing* that way, as she returned to her house.

The first phase of the conversation is closed. But Jesus has raised a sublime ideal in this woman's imagination—that of eternal life. Could he abandon her before having taught her more on this subject, since she had thus far shown herself teachable.

Vv. 16–18. "*Jesus says to her: Go, call thy husband, and come hither.* 17. *The woman answered and said: I have no husband. Jesus says to her: Thou hast well said: I have*[1] *no husband.* 18. *For thou hast had five*[2] *husbands, and he whom thou now hast is not thy husband. In this thou hast said truly.*"[3]—*Westcott* observes that the natural transition to this invitation, which is apparently so abrupt, is perhaps to be found in the last words of the woman: "that I pass no more this way to draw," which suggest persons of her family for whom she is performing this duty.—Must we seek the object of this request in the moral *effect* which it should produce on the woman, by giving Jesus the opportunity to prove to her his prophetic knowledge (*Meyer, Reuss*, etc.)? Certainly not, for there would then be a miracle of exhibition, which would not be in harmony with the ordinary simplicity of Jesus. The invitation must be its own justification. Others think that Jesus proposed to Himself to awaken in this woman the sense of her life of sin (*Tholuck, Luthardt, Bonnet, Weiss*, etc.). But under this form of supposition also, the means used have something of indirectness, which does not seem to be in entire conformity with the perfect sincerity of the Lord. The true reason of it seems to me rather to be this: Jesus did not wish to act upon a dependent person without the participation of the one to whom she was bound, and the more because the summoning of the latter might be the means of extending His work. *Meyer* makes the nature of the relation which united them an objection. But the arrival of this woman, at so unusual an hour, had undoubtedly been for Jesus the signal of a work to be done; and there is nothing to show that, when addressing this invitation to the woman, Jesus had her antecedents already present to His mind. Might not the term, *thy husband*, indeed, be completely justified by this supposition? The prophetic insight may not have been awakened in Him till He heard the answer which struck Him: "*I have no husband:*"—She had been married five times; and now, after these five lawful unions, she was living in an illicit relation. The fact that she did not venture to call the man with whom she is living *her husband*, shows in this woman a certain element of right character.

[1] ℵ Ita,q.; Heracleon: εχεις (*that thou hast not*) instead of εχω (*I have not*).

[2] Heracleon: εξ (*six*) instead of πεντε (*five*).

[3] ℵ E: αληθως instead of αληθες.

The reply of Jesus is not free from irony. The partial assent which He gives to the woman's answer, has something sarcastic in it. The same is true of the contrast which Jesus brings out between the number *five* and the: "I have no!"—The emphatic position of the pronoun σοῦ before ἀνήρ implies, perhaps, the following understood antithesis: "Not thine own, *but the husband of another.*" From this it would follow that she had lived in adultery. It is not absolutely necessary, however, to press so far the meaning of this construction.—Modern criticism, since the time of *Strauss* (see especially *Keim* and *Hausrath*), connects this part of the conversation with the fact that the Samaritan nation was formed of five eastern tribes which, after having each brought its own God, had adopted, besides, Jehovah, the God of the country (2 Kings xvii. 30, 31). The woman with her five husbands and the man with whom she was now living as the sixth, are, it is said, the symbol of the whole Samaritan people, and we have here a proof of the ideal character of this story. The view rests especially on this statement of Josephus (*Antiq.* ix. 14, 3): "Five nations having brought each its own God to Samaria." But 1, in the O. T. passage (2 Kings xvii. 30, 31), there is, indeed, a question of *five* peoples, but, at the same time, of *seven* gods, two peoples having introduced two gods. 2. These seven gods were all worshiped simultaneously, and not successively, up to the moment when they gave place to Jehovah; a fact which destroys the correspondence between the situations. 3. Is it conceivable that Jehovah would be compared to the sixth husband, who was evidently the worst of all in the woman's life? If the reading *six* of Heracleon, has reference to the ancient Samaritan religion, it does not refer to the addition of Jehovah to the other five gods, but rather to 2 Kings xvii. 30, where there is an allusion to six or seven gods brought in by the Eastern Gentiles.

Vv. 19, 20. "*The woman says to him: Sir, I see that thou art a prophet.* 20. *Our fathers worshiped in this mountain;*[1] *and you say that in Jerusalem is the place*[2] *where men ought to worship.*" Some see in this question of the woman only an attempt to turn aside the disturbance of her conscience, "a woman's ruse" (*de Wette*) with the design of escaping from a painful subject. "She diverts attention from her own life by proposing a point of controversy" (*Astié*). But would Jesus reply, as He does, to a question proposed in such a spirit? *Besser* and *Luthardt* go to the opposite extreme: This question is, in their view, the indication of a tortured conscience, which, sighing for pardon, desires to know the true sanctuary to which it can go to make expiation for its faults. This is still more forced. *Reuss*, with an irony which assails the evangelist himself, says: "If she asks the question thus, it is only for the purpose of bringing out the declaration of the Lord which we are about to read." Westcott says rightly: "Here is the very natural inquiry of a soul which finds itself face to face with an interpreter of the divine will." This woman has recognized in Jesus a

[1] All the Mjj.: εν τω ορει τουτω, instead of εν τουτω τω ορει which T. R. reads with Mnn.

[2] ℵ omits ο τοπος.

prophet; she has at the same time found in Him largeness of heart. The two answers, vv. 17, 19, have proved that, notwithstanding her faults, she is not altogether wanting in right character. It follows even from ver. 25 that religious thoughts are not strange to her, that she is looking for the Messiah and that she waits to receive from Him the explanation of the questions which embarrass her. The fact of a *Jewish* prophet, present before her eyes, inspires her with doubts as to the religious claim of her nation. Is it not an altogether simple thing, that, in her present situation, after her conscience has been so profoundly moved, her thoughts should turn to the great religious question which separates the two peoples, and that she should ask the solution of it? It is an anticipation of the more complete teaching which she expects from the Messiah. By the term: *our fathers*, she perhaps understands the Israelites of the time of Joshua, who, according to the reading of the Samaritan Pentateuch (Deut. xxvii. 4), raised their altar on Mount Gerizim, and not on Ebal; in any case, she understands by this expression all the Samaritan ancestors who had worshiped on Gerizim, from the period when a temple was built there in Nehemiah's time. This temple had been destroyed by John Hyrcanus one hundred and twenty-nine years before Christ. But even after this event, the place had remained a sacred spot Deut. xi. 29, as it still is at the present day. It is there that the Samaritans even now celebrate the feast of the Passover every year. Jerusalem not being named anywhere in the law, the preference of the Samaritans for Gerizim found plausible reasons in the patriarchal history. The superiority of the Jewish sanctuary could be justified only from the standpoint of the later books of the Old Testament. But we know that the Samaritans admitted only the Pentateuch and the Mosaic institution. When she said: *on this mountain*, she pointed to it with the finger. For Jacob's well is situated directly at the foot of Gerizim. She confines herself to setting forth the antithesis, thinking indeed that Jesus will understand the question which follows from it.

Ver. 21. "*Jesus says to her: Woman, believe me;*[1] *the hour cometh when neither on this mountain nor at Jerusalem shall ye worship the Father.*" The position of Jesus is a delicate one. He cannot deny the truth, and He must not repel this woman. His reply is admirable. He has just been called a prophet, and He prophesies. He announces a new economy in which the Samaritans, having become children of God, will be set free from that local sanctuary which the woman points out to Him on the summit of Gerizim, but without being compelled for this reason to go to Jerusalem. The filial character of this new worship will free it from all the external limitations by which all the old national worships were burdened. If the privilege of Gerizim passes away, it will not be that it may be assigned to Jerusalem. "You will not bring the Jews hither; but they shall no more force you to go to them. You shall meet each other,

[1] T. R. reads γυναι πιστευσον μοι with 14 Mjj. Italiq. Syr. while ℵ B C D L 3 Mnn. b Orig. read πιστευε μοι γυναι (D πιστευσον).

both parties alike, in the great family of the Father's worshipers." What treasures cast to such a soul! What other desire than that of doing His Father's will could inspire in Jesus such condescension!—The aorist πίστευσον in the T. R. signifies: "Perform an act of faith." We can understand the prefixing of the apostrophe: *woman*, in this reading which makes such an earnest appeal to her will. The present πίστευε in the Alexandrian documents simply signifies: "Believe from this moment and for the future." Both the readings may be sustained. This summons to faith answered to this woman's profession: "Thou art a prophet." The subject *you* of *shall worship* might denote the Samaritans and Jews (*Hilgenfeld*), or men in general (so in my 2d ed.), in contrast to Jesus Himself or to Jesus and His own. But this woman could not regard herself as the representative either of humanity in general, or of the Samaritans and Jews together. The subject of *you shall worship* must rather be derived from those words of her question in ver. 20: *Our fathers worshiped.* It is the Samaritans only.

Ver. 22. "*Ye worship that which ye do not know; we worship that which we know, because salvation comes from the Jews.*" The antithesis, which is so clearly marked between *ye* and *we* proves, whatever *Hilgenfeld* may say, who wrongly cites *Hengstenberg* as being of his opinion (comp. the Commentary of the latter, I. pp. 264–269), that the *ye* denotes the Samaritans and the *we* Jesus and the Jews. After having put His impartiality beyond suspicion by the revelation of the great future announced in ver. 21, Jesus enters more closely into the question proposed to Him and decides it, as related to the past, in favor of the Jews. "It is at Jerusalem that the living God has made Himself known; and that because it is by means of the Jews that He intends to give salvation to the world." God is known only so far as He gives Himself to be known. The seat of the true knowledge of Him can, therefore, only be where He makes His revelation; and this place is Jerusalem. By breaking with the course of theocratic development since the time of Moses, and rejecting the prophetic revelations, the Samaritans had separated themselves from the historic God, from the living God. They had preserved only the abstract idea of the one God, a purely rational monotheism. Now the *idea* of God, as soon as it is taken for God Himself, is no more than a chimera. Even while worshiping God, therefore, they *do not know* what they worship. The Jews, on the contrary, have developed themselves in constant contact with the divine manifestations; they have remained in the school of the God of revelation, and in this living relation they have preserved the principle of a true knowledge. And whence comes this peculiar relation between this people and God? The answer is given in what follows. If God has made Himself so specially known to the Jews, it is because He wished to make use of them, in order to accomplish the salvation of the world. It is salvation which, retroactively in some sort, has produced all the previous theocratic revelations, as it is the fruit which, although appearing at the end of the annual vegetation.is the real cause of it. The true cause of things is their aim. Thus is the ὅτι, *because*, explained.

This passage has embarrassed rationalistic criticism, which, making the Jesus of our Gospel an adversary of Judaism, does not allow that He could have proclaimed Himself *a Jew*, and have Himself united in this *we* His own worship and that of the Israelitish people. And indeed if, as *d'Eichthal* alleges (*Les Evangiles* I. p. xxviii.), the Jesus of the fourth Gospel, "from one end to the other of His preaching, seems to make sport of the Jews," and consequently cannot "be one of them," there is a flagrant contradiction between our passage and the entire Gospel. *Hilgenfeld* thinks that, at ver. 21, Jesus addresses the Jews and the Samaritans taken together, as by a kind of prosopopoeia, and that at ver. 22, by the words: *we worship that which we know*, he designates *Himself*, (with the believers) in opposition to these Jews and Samaritans. We have already seen at ver. 21 that this explanation cannot be sustained, and this appears more clearly still from the words of ver. 22: "Because salvation comes from *the Jews*," which evidently prove that the subject of "*we worship*" can only be the Jews. *D'Eichthal* and *Renan* make use here of different expedients. The enigma is explained, says the first, when it is observed that this expression is only "the annotation, or rather the protest, which a Jew of the old school had inscribed on the margin of the text, and of which an error of the copyist has made a word of Jesus" (p. xxix., note). And this scholar is in exstacies over the services which criticism can render to the interpretation of the sacred writings! Renan makes a similar hypothesis. "The 22d verse, which expresses an opposite thought to that of vv. 21 and 23, seems an awkward addition of the evangelist alarmed at the boldness of the saying which he reports" (p. 244, note). Arbitrariness could not be pressed further. The critic begins by decreeing what the fourth Gospel must be; an anti-Jewish book. Then, when he meets an expression which contradicts this alleged character, he rejects it with a stroke of the pen. He obtains, thus, not the Gospel which *is*, but that which he *would have*. But is it supposed that the first Jew whom one might meet was in possession of the authentic copy of our Gospel, to modify it according to his fancy; or that it was very easy for any chance foreigner, when this writing was once spread abroad, to introduce an interpolation into all the copies which were in circulation among the Churches? As for Renan's hypothesis, it supposes that the evangelist thought he knew more than the Master whom he worshiped; which is not very logical. The alleged incompatibility of this saying with vv. 21, 23, and with spirit of the fourth Gospel in general, is an assertion without foundation. (See Introduction, p. 127–134.)

At ver. 21 Jesus has transferred the question to the future, when the *localized* worship of ancient times should no longer exist. In ver. 22, He has justified the Jews, historically speaking. At ver. 23 He returns to the future announced in ver. 21, and describes all its grandeur.

Vv. 23, 24. "*But the hour cometh and now is, when the true worshipers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth; for also the Father seeketh such worshipers.* 24. *God is spirit, and they that worship him*[1] *must worship him in spirit and in truth.*"[2] *But:* in contrast with the period of Israelitish prerogative now ended. The words, *and now is*, added here, serve to arouse more strongly the already-awakened attention of the woman. It

[1] ℵ D d Heracleon Orig. omit αυτον after προσκυνουντας.

[2] ℵ reads: εν πνευματι αληθειας (*in the spirit of truth*).

is as if the first breath of the new era were just passing across this soul. Perhaps Jesus sees in the distance His disciples returning, the representatives of this nation of new worshipers which in a few moments will be recruited by the first-fruits of the Samaritan people. He brings out the two characteristics of the future worship: spirituality and truth. *Spirit* denotes here the highest organ of the human soul, by means of which it has communion with the divine world. It is the seat of contemplation, the place of the soul's meeting with God, the sanctuary where the true worship is celebrated; Rom. i. 9: "*God, whom I serve in my spirit*" (*ἐν τῷ πνεύματί μου*); Eph. vi. 18: *praying in the spirit* (*ἐν πνεύματι*). This *spirit*, in man, the *πνεῦμα ἀνθρώπινον*, remains a mere potentiality, so long as it is not penetrated by the Divine Spirit. But when this union is accomplished, it becomes capable of realizing the true worship of which Jesus speaks. This first feature marks the *intensity* of the new worship. The second, *truth*, is the corollary of the first. The worship rendered in the inner sanctuary of the spirit is the only true worship, because it alone is conformed to the nature of God, its object: "*God is spirit.*" The idea of *sincerity* does not fill out the meaning of the word *truth;* for a Jewish or Samaritan prayer might evidently be sincere. The truth of the worship is its inward character, in opposition to every demonstration without spiritual reality. Though these words exclude all subjection of Christian worship to the limitations of place or time, it is nevertheless true that by virtue of its very freedom, this worship can spontaneously accept conditions of time and place. But, as Mme. Guyon says, the external adoration is then "only a springing forth of the adoration of the Spirit" (quoted by *Astié*). The two defining words: *in spirit* and *in truth* are formal; the concrete character of the new worship is expressed by the word: *the Father*. The worship of which Jesus is speaking is the converse of a son with his father. We know from what source Jesus drew this definition of spiritual and true worship. "*Abba* (*Father*)" such was the constant expression of His inmost feeling. By adding that the Father, at this very moment, is *seeking* such worshipers, Jesus gives the woman an intimation that He is Himself the one sent by the Father to form this new people and that He invites her to become one of them.

The 24th verse justifies, from the essential nature of God, what He has just said of the spiritual and true nature of the worship now demanded by God Himself. Jesus does not give the maxim "*God is spirit*" as a new revelation. It is like an axiom from which He starts, a premise admitted by His interlocutor herself. The Old Testament taught, indeed, the spirituality of God in all its sublimity (1 Kings viii. 27), and the Samaritans certainly held it, like the Jews (see *Gesenius, de Samarit. theol.* p. 12, and *Lücke*). What is new in this saying is not the truth affirmed, but the consequence which Jesus draws from it with reference to the worship which was to come. He calls forth from it the idea of the people of the children of God offering throughout the whole world constant adoration; comp. Mal. i. 11. Thus to a guilty woman, perhaps an adulteress, Jesus reveals truths which He had probably never unfolded to His own disci-

ples.—The reading of the Sinaitic MS. ἐν πνεύματι ἀληθείας, *in the spirit of truth*, is derived from xiv. 17; xv. 26, etc., and arises from the false application of the word πνεῦμα to the Holy Spirit.

Ver. 25. "*The woman says to him, I know*[1] *that Messiah cometh (he who is called Christ); when he is come, he will declare unto us*[2] *all things.*"[3] The woman's answer bears witness of a certain desire for light. Her Spirit yearns for the perfect revelation. This is the reason why we were not wrong in interpreting vv. 15, 20 in a sense favorable to her character. According to modern accounts, the Samaritans actually expect a Messiah, to whom they give the name *Assaëf* (from שוב, *to return*); this word signifies, according to *Gesenius, he who brings back*, who converts; according to *de Sacy* and *Hengstenberg, he who returns*, in the sense that, as the expectation of the Samaritans was founded on Deut. xviii. 18: "*God will raise up for you another prophet from among your brethren, like unto me*," the Messiah to their view is a Moses who returns. At the present day, they call him *el-Muhdy*. There is a striking contrast between the notion of the Messiah, as it is expressed by the mouth of this woman, and the earthly and political notions on this subject which Jesus encountered in Israel. The Samaritan idea was imperfect, no doubt; the Messiah was a prophet, not a king. But it contained nothing false; and for this reason Jesus is able to appropriate it to Himself, and *here* declare Himself the Christ, which He did in Israel only at the last moment (xvii. 3; Matt. xxvi. 64). The translation ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστός, *who is called Christ*, belongs to the evangelist. He repeats this explanation, already given in i. 42, unquestionably because of the complete strangeness of this word Μεσσίας to Greek readers. It has been said that the Jewish term Messiah could not have been ascribed by John to this foreign woman. But this popular name might easily have passed from the Jews to the Samaritans, especially in the region of Shechem, which was inhabited by Jewish fugitives (Joseph. *Antiq.* xi. 8. 6). Perhaps, the very absence of the article before the word Μεσσίας, indicates that the woman uses this word as a proper name, as is done in the case of foreign words (comp. i. 42). The word ἔρχεται (*comes*) is an echo of the two ἔρχεται of vv. 21, 23; she surrenders herself to the impulse towards the new era which Jesus has impressed on her soul. The pronoun ἐκεῖνος, *he*, has, as ordinarily with John, an exclusive sense; it serves to place this revealer in contrast with all others; to that very one whom she had before her. The preposition in the verb ἀναγγελεῖ marks the perfect *clearness*, and the object, πάντα or ἅπαντα, the *complete* character of the Messiah's expected revelation.

Ver. 26. "*Jesus says to her: I who speak unto thee am he.*" Jesus, not having to fear, as we have just seen, that he would call forth in this woman a whole world of dangerous illusions, like those which, among the Jews, were connected with the name of Messiah, reveals Himself fully to her. This conduct is not therefore, as *de Wette* claims, in contradiction with

[1] G L A some Mnn. Syr. read οιδαμεν (*we know*).

[2] ℵ D (but not d) read αναγγελλει instead of αναγγελει (the present instead of the future).

[3] ℵ B C Orig. (four times) read απαντα instead of παντα.

such words as Matt. viii. 4; xvi. 20, etc. The difference in the soil explains the difference in the seed which the hand of Jesus deposits in it.

How can we describe the astonishment which such a declaration must have produced in this woman? It expresses itself, better than by words, in her silence and her conduct (ver. 28). She had arrived, a few minutes before, careless and given up to earthly thoughts; and lo, in a few moments, she is brought to a new faith, and even transformed into an earnest missionary of that faith. How did the Lord thus raise up and elevate this soul? When speaking with Nicodemus, He started from the idea which filled the heart of every Pharisee—that of the kingdom of God, and he drew from it the most rigorous moral consequences; for He knew that He was addressing a man accustomed to the discipline of the law. Then, He unfolded to him the truths of the divine kingdom, by connecting them with a striking Old Testament type and putting them in contrast with the corresponding features of the Pharisaic programme. Here, on the contrary, conversing with a woman destitute of all Scriptural preparation, He takes His point of departure from the commonest of things, the water of this well. Then, by a bold antithesis, He wakens in her mind the thought, in her heart the want, of a supernatural gift which may forever quench the heart's thirst. The aspiration for salvation once awakened becomes in her an inward prophecy to which He attaches His new revelations. By the teaching with reference to the true worship, He responds to the religious prepossessions of this woman, as directly as by the revelation of the heavenly things He had responded to the inmost thoughts of Nicodemus. With the latter He reveals Himself as the only-begotten Son, while still avoiding the title of *Christ*. With the Samaritan He boldly uses this latter term; but without dreaming of initiating into the mysteries of the incarnation and of redemption this soul which is yet only in the first rudiments of the moral life. Certain analogies have been observed in the outward course of these two conversations, and an argument has been drawn from them against the truth of the two stories. But this resemblance naturally results from what is analogous in the two meetings: on both sides, a soul wholly earthly finding itself in contact with a heavenly thought, and the latter trying to raise the other to its own level. This similarity in the situations sufficiently explains the correspondences of the two conversations, the diversity of which is, moreover, quite as remarkable as the resemblance.

II.—*Jesus and the Disciples:* vv. 27–38.

Ver. 27. *Upon this*[1] *his disciples came, and they were astonished*[2] *that he was speaking with a woman; yet no one of them said:*[3] *What seekest thou? or, Why speakest thou with her.*" There existed a rabbinical prejudice, according to which a woman is not capable of receiving profound religious instruc-

[1] ℵ D read εν τουτω instead of επι τουτω.

[2] T. R. reads εθαυμασαν with E S U V Δ Λ the larger part of the Mnn. Sah. etc. But ℵ A B C D G K L M It. Vulg. Cop. Orig. read εθαυμαζον (*were marveling*).

[3] ℵ D add αυτω (*to him*) after ειπεν.

tion: "Do not prolong conversation with a woman; let no one converse with a woman in the street, not even with his own wife; let a man burn the words of the law, rather than teach them to women" (see *Lightfoot* on this verse). Probably the apostles had not yet seen their Master set Himself above this prejudice.—We may hesitate between the two readings *marvelled* (ἐθαύμασαν) and *were marvelling* (ἐθαύμαζον). The first gives to the astonishment the character of a momentary act, the second makes of it a continuing state. Μέντοι: *However*, the astonishment did not extend so far in any one of them as to lead to ask Him for an explanation. Ζητεῖν, *to seek*, ask, refers to a service which He had requested, like that of ver. 10; λαλεῖν *to speak*, to a given instruction.

Vv. 28, 29. "*The woman therefore left her water-pot and went away into the city and says to the men:* 29. *Come, see a man who hath told me all the things that*[1] *I have done; can this be the Christ?*" *Therefore:* following upon the declaration of ver. 26, she does not speak, she acts, as one does when the heart is profoundly moved. She leaves her water-pot: this circumstance, apparently insignificant, is not without importance. It is the pledge of her early return, the proof that she goes to seek her husband and those whom she will find. She constitutes herself thereby a messenger, and, as it were, a missionary of Jesus. What a contrast between the vivacity of this conduct and the silent and meditative departure of Nicodemus! And what truth in the least details of this narrative!—Τοῖς ἀνθρώποις (*to the men*), to the first persons whom she met in the public square.—There is great simplicity in the expression: *All the things which I have done.*. She does not fear to awaken by this expression recollections which are by no means flattering to herself. She formulates her question in a way which seems to anticipate a negative answer (μήτι, *not however?*). "This is not, however, the Christ, is it?" She believes more than she says, but she does not venture to set forth, even as probable, so great a piece of news. What can be more natural than this little touch.

Ver. 30. "*They went out*[2] *of the city, and were coming towards him.*" The Samaritans, gathered by her, arrive in large numbers. The imperfect, *they were coming*, contrasted with the aorist, *they went out*, forms a picture; we see them hastening across the fields which separate Sychar from Jacob's well. This historical detail gives the key to Jesus' words, which are to follow. The *therefore* must be rejected from the text; the attention is wholly turned to the *they were coming*, which follows.

Vv. 31, 32. "*In the mean while, the disciples prayed him, saying: Master, eat.* 32. *But he said unto them, I have meat to eat which ye know not.*" Ver. 31 (after the interruption of vv. 28, 29), is connected with ver. 27. The words, ἐν δὲ τῷ μεταξύ (*in the mean while*), denote the time which elapsed between the departure of the woman and the arrival of the Samaritans. Ἐρωτᾶν (*to ask*) takes here, as often in the New Testament, and as שׁאל does

[1] Instead of παντα οσα, ℵ B C; Ita[lliq.]; Cop., read παντα α.

[2] T. R. reads ουν (*therefore*), after εξηλθον, with ℵ A.: several Mnn.; Ita[lliq.]; Sah. This particle is rejected by all the other Mjj.; Vss.; Orig.

in the Old Testament, the sense of *pray*, without, however, losing altogether its strict sense of *interrogate:* ask whether he will eat.

Since the beginning of His ministry, Jesus had perhaps had no joy such as this which He had just experienced. This joy had revived Him, even physically. "You say to me: eat! But I am satisfied; I have had, in your absence, a feast of which you have no suspicion." Ἐγώ (*I*), has the emphasis; this word places His person in strong contrast to theirs (ὑμεῖς, *you*): "You have your repast; I have mine."—Βρῶσις, strictly the act of eating, but including the food, which is its condition. The abstract word better suits the spiritual sense of this saying, than the concrete βρῶμα, (*food*).

Vv. 33, 34. "*The disciples therefore said one to another: Has any one brought him anything to eat?* 34. *Jesus says unto them: My meat is to do*[1] *the will of my Father and to accomplish his work.*" Μήτις introduces a negative question: "No one indeed has brought Him . . . ?" Jesus explains the profound meaning of His answer. Here He uses βρῶμα, in connection with the gross interpretation of the disciples. We need not see in the conjunction ἵνα, as *Weiss* would have us, a mere periphrasis for the infinitive. That which sustains Him is His *proposing to Himself* continually *to do . . . to accomplish . . .* The present ποιῶ—this is the reading of the T. R.—refers to the permanent accomplishment of the divine will at each moment, and the conjunctive aorist τελειώσω (*to accomplish, to finish*), refers to the end of the labor, to the perfect consummation of the task which will, of course, depend on the obedience of every moment (xvii. 4). The reading (ποιήσω), of the Vatican MS., Origen, and the Greco-Latin authorities spoils this beautiful relation; it is rejected by *Tischendorf* and *Meyer*. This ποιήσω arose from an assimilation to τελειώσω. The relation between the two substantives θέλημα (*will*), and ἔργον (*work*), corresponds with that of the two verbs. In order that the *work* of God may be accomplished at the last moment, His *will* must have been executed at every moment. Hereby Jesus makes His disciples see that, in their absence He has been laboring in the Father's work, and that it is this labor which has revived Him. This is the idea which He is about to develop, by means of an image which is furnished Him by the present situation.

Vv. 35, 36. "*Say ye not that there are yet*[2] *four months,*[3] *and the harvest cometh. Behold I say unto you: Lift up your eyes, and look on the fields, for they are white for the harvest.* 36. *Already even*[4] *he that reapeth receiveth wages, and gathereth fruit unto eternal life, that both*[5] *he that soweth and he that reapeth may rejoice together.*" The following verses (35–38) have presented such difficulties to interpreters, that some have supposed that they should be transposed by placing vv. 37, 38 before ver. 36 (*B. Crusius*). Weiss has

[1] Instead of ποιω which T. R. reads with 11 Mjj. [including ℵ), Mnn.; Vss., ποιησω is read in B D K L T^b, Orig. (three times).

[2] Ετι is wanting in D L Π, 60 Mnn.; Syr^{cur}; Orig. (sometimes).

[3] T R.: τετραμηνον with Π only, instead of τετραμηνος.

[4] T. R. reads και before ο θεριζων with 13 Mjj., omitted by ℵ B C D L T^b, It$^{alliq.}$; Orig.

[5] The και after ινα is rejected by B C L T^b U, Orig. (four times).

supposed that ver. 35 originally belonged to another context. It must be admitted that the interpretations proposed by *Lücke*, *de Wette*, *Meyer*, and *Tholuck* are not adapted to remove the difficulties. Some see in them a prophecy of the conversion of the Samaritan people, related in Acts viii.; others apply them even to the conversion of the entire Gentile world, and especially to the apostolate of St. Paul. In that case, it is not surprising that their authenticity should be suspected! If the words of vv. 36 ff., have no direct connection with the actual circumstances, how can we connect them with those of ver. 35, which, according to *Lücke* and *Meyer* themselves, can only refer to the arrival of the inhabitants of Sychar in the presence of Jesus? From a word stamped with the most perfect appropriateness, Jesus would suddenly pass to general considerations respecting the propagation of the Gospel. So de Wette, perceiving the impossibility of such a mode of speaking on Jesus' part, has, contrary to the evidence, resolutely denied the reference of ver. 35 to the arrival of the inhabitants of Sychar. This general embarrassment seems to us to proceed from the fact that the application of Jesus' words to the actual case has not been sufficiently apprehended and kept in mind. They have thus been despoiled of their appropriateness. A friendly and familiar conversation has been converted into a solemn sermon.

Ver. 35 is joined with ver. 30 precisely as ver. 31 is with ver. 27. Jesus gives His disciples to understand, as already appeared from His answer (ver. 34), that a scene is occurring at this moment of which they have not the least idea: while they are thinking only of the preparation of a meal to be taken, behold a harvest already fully ripe, the seeds of which have been sown in their absence, is prepared for them. Jesus Himself is, as it were, the point of union between the two scenes, altogether foreign to each other, which are passing around His person: that in which the disciples and that in which the Samaritans are, with Himself, the actors.—*Lightfoot*, *Tholuck*, *Lücke*, *de Wette* find a general maxim, a proverb, in the first words of ver. 35: When a man has once sowed, he must still wait four months for the time when he can reap—that is to say, the fruits of any work whatever are not gathered except after long waiting (2 Tim. ii. 6). But in Palestine not four, but six months separate the sowing (end of October) from the reaping (middle of April). Besides, the adverb ἔτι (there are *yet*) would not suit a proverb; the words: since the sowing, would have been necessary. Finally, why put this proverb especially into the mouth of the Apostles (*you*), rather than in that of men in general? There is then here a reflection which Jesus ascribes to His disciples themselves.—Between Jacob's well, at the foot of Gerizim, and the village of Aschar, at the foot of Ebal, far on into the plain of Mukhna, there stretch out vast fields of wheat. As they beheld the springing verdure on this freshly sown soil, they no doubt said to one another: we must wait yet four months till this wheat shall be ripe! From this little detail we must conclude that this occurred four months before the middle of April, thus about the middle of December, and that Jesus had consequently remained in Judea from the feast of the Passover until the close of the

year, that is, eight full months.—The words: *You say*, contrast the domain of nature to which this reflection of the disciples applies, to the sphere of the Spirit in which Jesus' thought is moving. In that sphere, indeed, the seed is not necessarily subject to such slow development. It can sometimes germinate and ripen as if in an instant. The proof of this is before their eyes at this very moment: ἰδού (*behold*)! This word directs the attention of the disciples to a spectacle which was wholly unexpected and even incomprehensible to their minds, that of the Samaritans who are hastening across the valley towards Jacob's well.—*I say unto you:* I who have the secret of what is taking place. The act of *raising the eyes* and *looking*, to which He invites them, is, according to *de Wette*, purely spiritual; Jesus would induce them to picture to themselves beforehand through faith, the future conversion of this people (comp. Acts viii.). But the imperative, θεάσασθε (*look*), must refer to an object visible at that very moment. And what meaning is to be given to the figure of *four months?* The fact to which these words refer, therefore, can only be the arrival of the people of Sychar. We understand, then, the use of the imperfect *they were coming* (ver. 30), which formed a picture and left the action incomplete. These eager souls who hasten towards Him disposed to believe—this is the spectacle which Jesus invites His disciples to behold. He presents these souls to them under the figure of a ripening harvest, which it only remains to gather in. And, as He thinks of the brief time needed by Him to prepare such a harvest in this place, until now a stranger to the kingdom of God, He is Himself struck by the contrast between the very long time (five to six months), which is demanded by the law of natural vegetation, and the rapid development which the divine seed can have in a moment, in the spiritual world; and, as an encouragement for His disciples in their future vocation, He points out to them this difference. The ἤδη (*already*), might be regarded as ending ver. 35. "They are white for the harvest *already*." This word would thus form the counterpart of ἔτι (*yet*), at the beginning of the verse; comp. 1 John iv. 3, where ἤδη is placed, in the same way, at the end of the sentence. This word, however, becomes still more significant, if it is placed, as we have placed it in the translation, at the opening of the following verse: ἤδη καί (*already even*). This is acknowledged by *Keil*, who rightly observes that in this way also *already* forms a contrast to *yet*.

There is, indeed, between ver. 35 and ver. 36, a climactic relation which betrays an increasing exaltation. "It is true," says Jesus, "that already the harvest is ripe, that at this very hour the reaper has only to take his sickle and reap, in order that both the sower and the reaper may in this case, at least, celebrate together the harvest-feast." If such is the meaning, the authenticity of καί, *and* (after ἤδη), is manifest, and Origen, with the Alexandrian authorities in his train, is found, once more, to have been an unfortunate corrector. After having connected ἤδη (*already*), with the preceding sentence, he rejected the καί (*and* or *even*), in order to make of ver. 36, instead of an expression full of appropriateness and charm, a general maxim. The reaper, according to ver. 38, must denote the apostles.

The expression, *μισθὸν λαμβάνειν* (*to receive wages*), describes the joy with which they are to be filled when gathering all these souls and introducing them into the kingdom of heaven. This expression (*receive wages*) is explained by *συνάγειν καρπόν* (*to gather fruit*). Perhaps there is a reference to the act of baptism (ver. 2), by which these new brethren, the believing Samaritans, are about to be received by the disciples into the Messianic community. And why must the reaper set himself at work without delay? Because there is something exceptional to happen on this day, *ἵνα* (*in order that*). God has intended in this circumstance to bring to pass a remarkable thing, namely: that both the sower and the reaper may once rejoice together. Those who apply the figure of the harvest to the future conversion of the Samaritans by the apostles, or to that of the Gentile world by St. Paul, are obliged to refer the common joy of the sower (Jesus), and the reaper (the apostles), to the *heavenly triumph* in which the Lord and His servants will rejoice together in the fruit of their labor. But, first, this interpretation breaks all logical connection between ver. 35 and ver. 36. How pass directly from this spectacle of the Samaritans who hasten to Him to the idea of the future establishment of the Gospel in their country or in the world? Then, the present *χαίρῃ* (*may rejoice*), refers naturally to a present joy, contrary to *Meyer*. *Luthardt* seeks to escape the difficulty by giving to *ὁμοῦ* (*together*), the sense, not of a *simultaneous* joy, but of a *common* joy, which is, of course, impossible. This sense of the adverb would, moreover, suppress the idea which constitutes the beauty of this expression, the simultaneousness of the joy of the two laborers. Jesus recognizes in what takes place at this moment, a feast which the Father has prepared for Him, and which He, the sower, is about to enjoy at the same time with His disciples, the reapers. In Israel Jesus has sowed, but He never has had the joy of being Himself present at a harvest. The ingathering will one day take place, no doubt, but when He will be no longer there. Here, on the contrary, through His providential meeting with this woman, through her docility and the eagerness of this population which hastens to Him, He sees the seed spring up and ripen in a moment, so that the harvest can be gathered, and He, the sower, may, at least once in His life, participate in the harvest-feast. This simultaneousness of joy, altogether exceptional, is strongly brought out by the *ὁμοῦ* (*together*), but also by the double *καί* ("*both* the sower *and* the reaper"), and by the *ἤδη* (*already*), at the beginning of the clause. To understand fully the meaning of this gracious expression, we must remember that the Old Testament established a contrast between the function of the sower (united with that of the laborer), and the office of the reaper. The first was regarded as a painful labor; Ps. cxxvi. 5, 6: "Those who sow *with tears* . . . He who puts the seed in the ground shall go *weeping* . . ." The reaper's task, on the contrary, was regarded as a joyous thing. "They shall reap *with a song of triumph* . . . He shall return *with rejoicing*, when he shall bring back his sheaves." On this day, by reason of the rapidity with which the seed has germinated and ripened, the labor of the seed sowing meets the joyous shouts of the harvest. Herein is the explanation of the

construction by which the verb χαίρῃ is much more closely connected, in the Greek sentence, with the first subject ὁ σπείρων, *the sower*, than with the second ὁ θερίζων, *the reaper*: "that the sower *may rejoice* at the same time with the reaper."

Weiss refers the *in order that* to the intention of the reaper, who, being in the service of the same landholder as the sower, wishes that the latter also may rejoice with him. The idea, if we thoroughly understand him, is that the disciples were to reap in their future ministry, and this in order that Jesus may rejoice in heaven, at the same time that they rejoice on earth. But where has Jesus ever given to His disciples such a motive as this? And in what connection would this expression stand with the present case?

Vv. 37, 38. "*For herein is the saying*[1] *true: The sower is one and the reaper another.* 38. *I sent*[2] *you to reap that whereon ye have not labored; other men labored, and ye are entered into their labor.*" According to *Tholuck*, Jesus is grieved at the thought that He is not Himself to be present at the conversion of the Gentiles, after having prepared the way for it, and to this point it is that the proverb refers. *Astié* appears to be of the same opinion. *Westcott* thinks that Jesus prepares the apostles for the future disappointments in the apostleship. They would then be the sowers who do not reap, while the whole context proves that only Jesus can be so. *Weiss:* In this region of the spiritual harvest it is not as in ordinary harvests, where the sower is often the same as the reaper. But then the origin of the common maxim which Jesus quotes is not explained, for it expresses just the contrary of what would most frequently be the case in life. Then, this sense of ἐν τούτῳ, "in the spiritual domain," is hardly natural. This form of expression has rather a logical sense: "*In this*," that is, "in that you reap to-day what has been sown in your absence and without your knowledge" (ver. 36): thus is the common saying verified. *For* if this proverb is false in the sense which is ordinarily assigned to it, namely, that he who does the main part of the labor is rarely the one who gathers the fruit of it (an accusation against Providence), it is nevertheless true in this respect, that there is a distinction of persons between him who has the charge of sowing and him who has the mission of reaping. This distinction was at the foundation (*for*) of the saying in ver. 36, since the *community* of joy declared in that verse rests upon the duality of persons and offices affirmed by the proverb ver. 37: "*one . . . another. . . .*"—Ἀληθινός, not in the sense of ἀληθής, veritable, which says truth, but in the ordinary Johannean sense: which answers to the idea of the thing; thus: *The* or (without the ὁ) *a* saying which is the true maxim to be pronounced. This distinction, of which they have this day the evidence, between him who sows and him who reaps—on this it is that the whole activity to which Jesus has called them will rest: such is the idea of ver. 38.

Ver. 38. As preachers, the apostles will do nothing but reap that which

[1] The article ὁ before αληθινος is rejected by B C K L Δ some Mnn. Heracleon, Orig.

[2] ℵ D read απεσταλκα, instead of απεστειλα.

has been painfully sown by *others*. These last are, undoubtedly, John the Baptist and Jesus Himself, those two servants who, after having painfully ploughed the furrow, have watered with their blood the seed which they had deposited in it. Only there is ordinarily a misapprehension of the allusion which Jesus makes to the particular fact which has given occasion to these words, and which is, as it were, an illustration of them. "That will happen in all your career which is occurring to-day." *I have sent you to reap:* Jesus had done this by calling them to the apostleship (vi. 70; Luke vi. 13).—*That on which you have not labored:* This harvest in Samaria —they have not prepared it, any more than they have prepared that which they will reap afterwards in preaching the Gospel. *Others have labored:* in the present case, Jesus and the Samaritan woman—the one by His word, the other by her eager hastening. What an enigma for the disciples—this population hastening to Jesus to surrender themselves to His divine influence,—and, what is more, Samaritans! What has taken place in their absence? Who has prepared such a result? Who has sown this sterile ground? Jesus seems to rejoice in their surprise. And it is, no doubt, with a friendly smile that He throws out to them these mysterious words: *Others labored.* They may see here an example of what they will afterwards experience: In all their ministry nothing different will occur. Commentators discuss the question whether, by this word *others*, Jesus designates *Himself* alone (*Lücke, Tholuck, de Wette, Meyer* and *Weiss*), taking *others* as the plural of category; or *Himself* and *the prophets*, including *John the Baptist* (*Keil*); or all these personages except Jesus (*Olshausen*). *Westcott* applies this word *others* to all the servants of God in the Old Testament (perhaps with an allusion to Josh. xxiv. 13). The disciples have entered into the work of their predecessors through their fruitful ministry in Judea (ver. 2). But to what end say all this precisely in Samaria? The two most curious explanations are certainly those of *Baur* and *Hilgenfeld*. According to the first, by the term *others*, Jesus designates the evangelist Philip (Acts viii.), and by the *reapers*, the apostles, Peter and John, in the story in Acts viii. 15. To the view of the second, the term *others* designates St. Paul, and the reapers are the Twelve, who seek to appropriate to themselves the fruit of his labor among the Gentiles. On these conditions, one might wager that he could find anything in any text whatever. These forced meanings and the grave critical consequences which are drawn from them, arise in large measure from the fact that the wonderful appropriateness of these words of Jesus, as He applied them to the given situation, has not been apprehended.

Jesus is thinking undoubtedly on His own work and that of John, and the perfect: *you are entered*, is indeed that which is ordinarily understood by it, a prophetic anticipation; but this form can be well explained only by means of a present fact which suggests it. We discover here, with *Gess*, the contrast between the manner in which Jesus regarded His work and the idea which the forerunner had formed of it beforehand. "For the latter the time of the Messiah was the harvest; Jesus, on the contrary, here regards the days of His flesh as a mere time of sowing."

We can understand how it must have been more and more difficult for John to bring his thought into accord with the work of Jesus.

The heavenly joy which fills the Lord's heart throughout this section has its counterpart only in the passage, Luke x. 17–24. Here it even assumes a character of gaiety. Is it John's fault, if *Renan* finds in the Jesus of the fourth Gospel only a heavy metaphysician?

III.—*Jesus and the Samaritans:* vv. 39–42.

Vv. 39–42. "*Now many of the Samaritans of that city believed on him*[1] *because of the word of the woman who testified: He told me all things that*[2] *I have done.* 40. *When, therefore, the Samaritans came unto him, they besought him to abide with them; and he abode there*[3] *two days.* 41. *And many more believed on him because of his word.* 42. *And they said to the woman: No longer because of thy saying*[4] *do we believe; for we have heard him ourselves,*[5] *and we know that this is indeed the Saviour of the world.*"[6] Here now is the harvest-feast announced in ver. 36: The sower rejoices with the reapers. This time passed at Sychar leaves an ineffaceable impression on the hearts of the apostles, and the sweetness of this recollection betrays itself in the repetition of the words *two days*, in the fortieth and forty-third verses. Δέ, *now*, resumes the course of the narrative after the digression in vv. 31–38. What a difference between the Samaritans and the Jews! Here a miracle of knowledge, without éclat, is enough to dispose the hearts of the people to come to Jesus, while in Judea eight months of toil have not procured for him one hour of such refreshment.

The thirty-ninth verse has shown us the first degree of faith: The *coming to Jesus*, as the result of testimony. The fortieth and forty-first verses present the higher degree of faith, its development through personal contact with Jesus.

Ver. 41 marks a two-fold advance, one in the number of believers, the other in the nature of their faith. This latter advance is expressed in the words: *Because of His word*, contrasted with the words: *Because of the woman's story* (ver. 39); it is reflectively formulated in the declaration of ver. 42. The Samaritans reserve the more grave term λόγος for the word of Jesus; they apply to the talk of the woman the term λαλία, which has in it, undoubtedly, nothing contemptuous (viii. 43, where Jesus applies it to His own discourses), but which denotes something more outward, a mere *report*, a *piece of news*. The verb ἀκηκόαμεν, *we have heard*, has in the Greek no object; the idea is concentrated in the subject αὐτοί: "We have *ourselves* become hearers;" whence follows: "And *as such* we know." The reading of the Sinaitic MS.: "We have heard *from him* (from his mouth)

[1] ℵ Ita,b,q Orig., omit εις αυτον (*on him*).

[2] ℵ B C L Ita,b,q Syr. Cop. read α instead of οσα.

[3] ℵ Syr.: παρ' αυτοις (*with them*), instead of εκει (*there*).

[4] Instead of σην λαλιαν B: λαλιαν σου; ℵ D Ita,b,q σην μαρτυριαν.

[5] ℵ Syrcur add παρ αυτου (*from him*).

[6] 16 Mjj., most of the Mnn., Ita,b,q Syrsch add, with the T. R., ο χριστος. These words are rejected by ℵ B C Tb., some Mnn., Itplerique Vulg. Cop., Syrcur Orig. Iren. Heracleon.

and we know that . . . ," would give to the following profession the character of an external and slavish repetition, opposed to the spirit of the narrative. The expression: *The Saviour of the world* seems to indicate an advance in the notion of the Messiah in these Samaritans. The question is of salvation, and no longer merely of teaching as in ver. 25. This expression is, perhaps, connected with the word of Jesus to the woman (ver. 22), which Jesus must have developed to them: "*Salvation* is from the Jews." *Tholuck* and *Lücke* suspect the historical truth of this term *Saviour of the world*, as too universalistic in the mouth of these Samaritans. By what right? Did not these people possess in their Pentateuch the promise of God to Abraham: "*All the families of the earth shall be blessed in thy seed*," to which Jesus might have called their attention? And had they not just been, during those two days, in direct contact with the love of the true Christ, so opposite to the particularistic arrogance of Jewish Pharisaism? The Alexandrian authorities reject the words *ὁ χριστός, the Christ*. Undoubtedly there might be seen in them the seal of the union announced by Jesus (vv. 23, 24) between the Samaritans (the *Saviour of the world*) and the Jews (the *Christ*). But it is easier to understand how this term may have been added, than how it could have been rejected.

The eager welcome which Jesus found among the Samaritans is an example of the effect which the coming of Christ should have produced among His own. The faith of these strangers was the condemnation of Israel's unbelief. It was, undoubtedly, under this impression that Jesus, after those two exceptional days in His earthly existence, resumed His journey to Galilee.

THIRD SECTION.

IV. 43–54.

Jesus in Galilee.

In Judea, unbelief had prevailed. In Samaria, faith had just appeared. Galilee takes an intermediate position. Jesus is received there, but by reason of His miracles accomplished at Jerusalem, and on condition of responding immediately to this reception by new prodigies. The following narrative (comp. ver. 48) furnishes the proof of this disposition of mind. Such is the import of this narrative in the whole course of the Gospel.

Vv. 43–45 describe the general situation. Then, on this foundation there rises the following incident (vv. 46–54). We may compare here the relation of the conversation with Nicodemus to the general representation in ii. 23–25, or that of the last discourse of the forerunner to the representation in iii. 22–24.

1. Vv. 43–45.

Vv. 43–45. "*After these two days, he departed thence and went away*[1] *into Galilee.* 44. *For Jesus Himself had declared that a prophet has no honor in*

[1] ℵ B C D T^{b} It^{plerique} Syr^{cur} Cop. Orig. omit the words και απηλθεν (*went away*) after εκειθεν.

his own country. 45. *When*[1] *therefore he came into Galilee, the Galileans received him, because they had seen all the things that he*[2] *did in Jerusalem, at the feast; for they also went*[3] *to the feast.*" This passage has from the beginning been a *crux interpretum.* How can John give as the cause (*for*, ver. 44) of the return of Jesus to Galilee this declaration of the Lord "that no prophet is honored in his own country!" And how can he connect with this adage as a consequence (*therefore*, ver. 45) the fact that the Galileans gave Him an eager welcome? 1. *Brückner* and *Luthardt* think that Jesus *sought* either conflict (*Brückner*) or solitude (*Luthardt*). This would well explain the *for* of ver. 44. But it would be necessary to admit that the foresight of Jesus was greatly deceived (ver. 45), which is absolutely opposed to the particle οὖν (*therefore*), which connects ver. 45 with the preceding. Instead of *therefore*, *but* would have been necessary. Moreover, Jesus did not seek conflict, since He abandoned Judea in order to avoid it; still less solitude, for He wished to work. 2. *Weiss*, nearly like Brückner: Jesus leaves to His disciples the care of reaping joyously in Samaria afterwards; He Himself goes to seek the hard labor of the sower in Galilee. But the thought of the future evangelization of Samaria is altogether foreign to this passage (see above); and ver. 45 is opposed to this sense; for it makes prominent precisely the fact that Jesus found in Galilee the most eager welcome. Weiss escapes this difficulty only by making the *therefore* of ver. 45 relate to ver. 43 and not to ver. 44, and by making it a particle designed to indicate the *resumption* of the narrative. But after the *for* of ver. 44, *therefore* has necessarily the argumentative sense. 3. According to *Lücke*, *de Wette* and *Tholuck*, the *for* of ver. 44 is designed to explain, not what precedes, but the fact which is about to be announced, ver. 45.[4] The sense would, thus, be: "Jesus had *indeed* declared . . . ;" this *indeed* relating to the fact mentioned in ver. 45, that the Galileans no doubt received Him, but only because of the miracles of which they had been witnesses. But this very rare use of γάρ is foreign to the New Testament. This interpretation is hardly less forced than that of *Kuinoel*, who gives to *for* the sense of *although*, as also *Ostervald* translates. 4. *Origen*, *Wieseler*, *Ebrard*, *Baur* and *Keil* understand by ἰδία πατρίς (*his own country*), *Judea*, as the place of Jesus' birth. By this means, the two difficulties of the *for* and the *therefore* pass away at once. But common sense tells us that, in the maxim quoted by Jesus, the word *country* must denote the place where the prophet has lived and where he has been known from infancy, and not that where he was merely born. It is, therefore, very evident that, in the thought of John, His own country is Galilee. 5. *Calvin*, *Hengstenberg* and *Bäumlein* understand by *his own country* especially *Nazareth*, in contrast with the rest of Galilee, and with Capernaum in particular where He went to make His abode. He came, not to Nazareth, as might have been expected, but to Capernaum. (Comp. Mark vi.

[1] ℵ D read ως instead of οτε (probably according to ver. 40).

[2] A B C L Orig. (4 times) read οσα for α.

[3] ℵ It. read εληλυθεισαν for ηλθον.

[4] Comp. *Tholuck*, Commentary on the Ep. to the Rom. 5th ed. chap. ii. ver. 1.

1; Matt. xiii. 54–57; Luke iv. 16, 24.) *Lange* applies the term *country* to the whole of lower Galilee, in which Nazareth was included, in opposition to upper Galilee where Jesus went to fix His abode from this time. But how could Nazareth, or the district of Nazareth, be thus, without further explanation, placed outside of Galilee, or even in contrast with that province? It might still be comprehensible, if, in the following narrative, John showed us Jesus fixing His abode at Capernaum; but it is to Cana that He betakes Himself, and this town was very near to Nazareth. 6. *Meyer* seems to us quite near the truth, when he explains: Jesus, knowing well that a prophet is not honored in his own country, began by making Himself honored *outside of it*, at Jerusalem (ver. 45); and thus it was that He returned now to Galilee with a reputation as a prophet, which opened for Him access to hearts in His own country. *Reuss* is disposed to hold the same relation of thought: "In order to be received in Galilee, He had been obliged first to make Himself acknowledged outside of it."

The complete explanation of this obscure passage follows, as in so many cases, from the relation of the fourth Gospel to the Synoptics. The latter make the Galilean ministry begin immediately after the baptism. But John reminds us here, at the time of Jesus' settlement in Galilee, that Jesus had followed a course quite different from that which the earlier narratives seemed to attribute to Him. The Lord knew that the place where a prophet has lived is the one where, as a rule, he has most difficulty in finding recognition. He began, therefore, by working at Jerusalem and in Judea for quite a long time (almost a whole year: ver. 35), and it was only after this that He came in the strict sense to begin His ministry in Galilee, that ministry with which the narrative of the other Gospels opens. The meaning, therefore, is: It was then, and only then, (not immediately after the baptism), that He commenced the Galilean work with which every one is acquainted. We find in this passage, as thus understood, a new confirmation of our remarks on iii. 24. If the *for*, ver. 44, indicates the cause of Jesus' mode of acting, the *therefore*, ver. 45, brings out in relief the joyful result and serves thus to justify the wisdom of the course pursued. The Galileans who had seen Him at work on the grand theatre of the capital, made no difficulty now in welcoming Him. The words καὶ ἀπῆλθεν, *and went away*, are rejected by the Alexandrian authorities; perhaps they were added from ver. 13.

Ver. 44. Αὐτός, *he*, the same who apparently was acting in an opposite way. The solution of the contradiction is given in ver. 45. Ἐμαρτύρησεν, *testified*, can here, whatever *Meyer*, *Weiss*, etc., may say, have only the sense of the pluperfect, like ἐποίησεν and ἦλθον which follow. It is difficult to believe, indeed, that John quotes here, for the purpose of explaining the conduct of Jesus, a declaration which was uttered at an epoch much farther on, like that of Mark vi. 4. Comp. Luke iv. 24, which assigns to this saying a much earlier date. The idea of the quoted proverb is that one is less disposed to recognize a superior being in a fellow countryman, very nearly connected with us, than in a stranger who is clothed, to our view, in a veil of mystery. But after that this same man has brought

himself to notice elsewhere and on a wider theatre, this glory opens the way for Him to the hearts of His own fellow-citizens. That moment had arrived for Jesus; this is the reason why He now braves the vulgar prejudice which He had Himself pointed out; and of which we have seen an instance in the reply of Nathanael, i. 47. And the success justifies this course. The words *πάντα ἑωρακότες*, *having seen . . .*, explain the *ἐδέξαντο*, *they received:* there is undoubtedly an allusion to ii. 23–25. This verse finds its commentary in Luke iv. 14, 15: *"And Jesus returned to Galilee in the power of the Spirit, and his fame spread abroad through all the region round about; and He taught in their synagogues, being glorified by all."*

2. Vv. 46–54.

Vv. 46, 47. *"He came,*[1] *therefore, again to Cana of Galilee where he had changed*[1] *the water into wine. And*[2] *there was at Capernaum*[3] *a king's officer, whose son was sick.* 47. *He, having heard that Jesus had come from Judea into Galilee, went unto him and besought him*[4] *that he would come down and heal his son; for he was at the point of death."* *Therefore* connects with ver. 3 and ver. 45. Jesus directed His course towards Cana, not, as *Weiss* thinks, because His family had settled there (comp. ii. 12 with Matt. iv. 13), but undoubtedly because it was there that He could hope to find the soil best prepared, by reason of His previous visit. This is perhaps what St. John means to intimate by the reflection, *"where he had changed the water into wine."* His coming made a sensation, and the news promptly spread as far as Capernaum, situated seven or eight leagues eastward of Cana. The term *βασιλικός*, in Josephus, denotes a public functionary, either civil or military, sometimes also an employé of the royal house. This last meaning is here the most natural one. Herod Antipas, who reigned in Galilee, had officially only the title of tetrarch. But in the popular language that of King, which his father had borne, was given him. It is not impossible that this nobleman of the king's household may have been either Chuza, "Herod's steward" (Luke viii. 3), or Manaen, his "foster-brother" (Acts iii. 1). By its position at the end of the clause, the defining expression *at Capernaum* (which refers, not to *was sick*, but to *there was*) strongly emphasizes the notoriety which the return of Jesus had speedily acquired in Galilee.

Ver. 48. *"Jesus therefore said to him: Unless ye see signs and wonders ye will in no wise believe."* This reply of Jesus is perplexing; for it seems to suppose that this man asked for the miracle to the end of believing, which is certainly not the case. But the difficulty is explained by the plurals, *ye see, ye will believe*, which prove that this expression is not the reply to the father's request, but a reflection which He makes on occasion of that request. It is true, He addresses the remark to the man who is the occa-

[1] ℵ reads *ηλθαν, εποιησαν*; *"They came, they had changed."* (!)

[2] ℵ D L T^{b} It.: *ην δε* instead of *και ην*.

[3] ℵ B C D T^{b} It^{plerique}: *Καφαρναουμ*.

[4] ℵ B C D L T^{b} It$^{alliq.}$ omit *αυτου*.

sion of it (*πρὸς αὐτόν*), but He speaks thus, with reference to all the Galilean people, whose moral tendency this man represents, to His view, at this moment. Indeed, the disposition which Jesus thus meets at the moment when He sets foot again on Israelitish soil, is the tendency to see in Him only a thaumaturge (worker of miracles); and He is so much the more painfully affected since He has just passed two days in Samaria, in contact with an altogether opposite spirit. There, it was as the Saviour of souls that He was welcomed. Here, it is bodily cures which are immediately asked of Him. He seems to be fit for nothing but to heal. And He is obliged to confess—such is the true meaning of His word—that if He refuses to play this part, there is reason to fear that no one will believe, or rather, according to the slightly ironical turn of expression of which He makes use (*οὐ μή*), "that it is not to be feared that any one will believe." There is likewise the expression of a painful feeling in the accumulation of the two nearly synonymous terms *σημεῖα* and *τέρατα*, *signs* and *wonders*. The first designates the miracle as related to the fact of the invisible world which it manifests; the second characterizes it as related to external nature, whose laws it sets at defiance. The latter term, therefore, brings out with more force the sensible character of the supernatural manifestation. The meaning, therefore, is: "You must have signs; and you are not satisfied unless these signs have the character of wonders." Some have found in *ἴδητε*, *ye see*, an allusion to the request which is addressed to Him to go personally to the sick person, which proves, it is said, that the father wishes to *see* the healing with his own eyes. But in that case *ἴδητε* ought to stand at the beginning; and the meaning is forced.

Vv. 49, 50. "*The officer says to him: Sir, come down ere my child die.*[1] 50. *Jesus says to him: Go thy way, thy son liveth. And*[2] *the man believed the word which Jesus had*[3] *said to him, and he went his way.*" The father has well understood that the remark of Jesus is not an answer, and consequently not a refusal. He renews his request, employing the term of affection *τὸ παιδίον μου*, *my little child*, which renders his request more touching. Jesus yields to the faith which breathes in his prayer, but in such a way as immediately to elevate the faith to a higher degree. There are at once in this answer: "*Go thy way, thy son liveth*," a granting of the request and a partial refusal, which is a test. The healing is granted; but without Jesus leaving Cana; He wishes this time to be believed on His word. Until now the father had believed on the testimony of others. Now his faith is to rest on a better support, on the personal contact which he has just had with the Lord Himself. For the term *παιδίον* Jesus substitutes *υἱός*, *son*. This is the term of dignity; it exalts the worth of the child, as representing the family. The father lays hold by faith upon the promise of Jesus, that is to say, on Jesus Himself in His word; the test is sustained.

Vv. 51–53. "*As he was now going down, his servants met*[4] *him, and told*[5]

[1] A and some Mnn. read *υιον* instead of *παιδιον*; ℵ *παιδα*.

[2] *Και* is wanting in ℵ B D It$^{\text{alliq}}$ Vulg.

[3] ℵ: *του Ιησου* instead of ω . . . . *Ιησους*.

[4] Instead of *απηντησαν*, ℵ B C D K L 20 Mnn. read *υπηντησαν*.

[5] ℵ D read *ηγγειλαν* for *απηγγειλαν*.

him saying:[1] *Thy son liveth.*[2] 52. *So he inquired of them the hour when he began to mend. They said to him: yesterday,*[3] *at the seventh hour, the fever left him.* 53. *The father, therefore, knew that it was at that hour*[4] *in which Jesus had said to him:*[5] *Thy son liveth. And he believed, himself and all his house.*" The servants, in their report, use neither the term of affection (*παιδίον*), which would be too familiar, nor that of dignity (*υἱός*), which would not be familiar enough, but that of family life: *παῖς, the child*, which the T. R. rightly gives. The selected term *κομψότερον*, suits well the mouth of a man of rank. It is the expression of a comparative improvement; as we say, *finely*. The seventh hour, according to the ordinary Jewish mode of reckoning, denotes one o'clock in the afternoon (see on i. 40). But if it was at that hour that Jesus had given his answer to the father, how was it that he did not return to his home on the same day? For seven leagues only separate him from his house. Those also who, like *Keil, Westcott*, etc., think that John used, in general, the mode of reckoning the hours which was usual in the Roman courts, support their view, with a certain probability, by our passage. Nevertheless, even on the supposition that Χθές, *yesterday*, proves that it was really the following day, in the ordinary sense of the word, this delay may be explained either by the necessity of letting his horses rest or by the fear of traveling by night. But the term *yesterday* does not even compel us to suppose that a night has elapsed since the healing of the child. For as the day, according to the Hebrews, closed at sunset, the servants might, some hours after this, say *yesterday*.

At this moment the faith of this man rises, at last, to a higher degree, that of personal experience. Hence the repetition of the word: *and he believed;* comp. ii. 11. The entire household is borne on by this movement of faith impressed on the heart of their head.

Ver. 54. "*Jesus did, again, this second sign, on coming out of Judea into Galilee.*" The word *δεύτερον* cannot be an adverb: *for the second time;* this would be a useless synonym for *πάλιν, again*. It is, then, an adjective, and, notwithstanding the absence of an article, a predicative adjective. "He did *again* (*πάλιν*) this miracle, and that as a *second* one." There is evidently something strange in this somewhat extreme manner of expressing himself: *again* and as a *second*. There is an indication here which betrays one of those disguised intentions which are so frequent in the fourth Gospel. The expression employed here can only be explained by closely connecting the verb *did* with the participle *coming into*, which follows. Other miracles in large numbers had occurred between the first act at Cana, ii. 11 and this one; this was not therefore the second, speaking absolutely. Two ideas are united in this clause: He did a *second* miracle at Cana, and He did it *again on coming* from Judea into Galilee. In other terms: Also this second time Jesus signalized His return to Galilee, as the first time, by a new miracle done at Cana. It will be in vain to refuse to

[1] ℵ D b omit λεγοντες.
[2] D K L U II. Syr. read υιος instead of παις. ℵ A B C: αυτου instead of σου.
[3] Χθες in 11 Mjj., εχθες in 8.
[4] ℵ B C reject the first εν.
[5] ℵ A B C L omit οτι.

acknowledge this intention of the evangelist. It is a fact, that John shows himself concerned to distinguish these first two returns which the tradition had confounded. He makes prominent the miracle of chap. ii. and this one as the two enduring monuments of that distinction.

Irenæus, Semler, de Wette, Baur, Ewald, Weiss, unhesitatingly identify this miracle with the healing of the Gentile centurion's servant, Matt. viii. 5 and Luke vii. 3. As to the differences of details, they give the preference, some to the account of the Synoptics, others to that of John. In the two cases, the cure is wrought at a distance; this is all that the two events have in common. The charge of unbelief which, in the view of *Weiss*, is another common feature, on the contrary profoundly distinguishes them. For, in John, it is addressed to the people including the father, while in the Synoptics it applies only to the nation from which the father is distinguished as the example of the most extraordinary faith of which Jesus has yet been witness. And yet here is the same story! Moreover, all the details are different, even opposite. Here a father and his son, there a master and his servant. Here a Jew, there a Gentile. Here it is at Cana, there at Capernaum, that the event occurs. Here the father wishes Jesus to travel to the distance of six leagues; there the centurion absolutely denies the intention of making Him come to his house, and this in the same city. Finally, as we have said; here is a sample of the sickly faith of the Galileans; there an incomparable example of faith given by a Gentile to the whole people of Israel. If these two narratives refer to the same event, the Gospel history is thoroughly unsound. *Weiss* so clearly sees this alleged identity melt away in his hands, that he is obliged to bring in a third story, that of the healing of the epileptic child (Matt. xvii.), with which John blended the one which occupies our attention.

This 54th verse closes the cycle began at ii. 12, as its counterpart ii. 11 closed the cycle opened by i. 19. Of these two cycles, the first recounts the manner in which Jesus passed from private life to His public ministry: the latter relates the beginnings of His work.

The first contains three groups of narratives: 1. The testimonies of John the Baptist; 2. The coming to Jesus of His first disciples; 3. The wedding at Cana. The second shows us Jesus: 1. In Judea; 2. In Samaria; 3. In Galilee. Each particular narrative is preceded by a short preamble in which the general situation is sketched (ii. 12, 13; ii. 23–25; iii. 22–24; iv. 1–3 and iv. 43–45). The revelation of Jesus goes forward in a continuous way: at the Jordan, at Cana, in the temple, with Nicodemus, in Samaria, in Galilee. But the national unbelief manifests itself: before it, He is obliged to retire from the temple to the city, from the city to the country, from Judea to Galilee. But, at the same time, faith comes to light and is developed: in all its integrity in the disciples; as a feeble glimmering in Nicodemus; dimmed by an intermingling of carnal elements in Galilee.

SECOND PART.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF UNBELIEF IN ISRAEL.

V. 1–XII. 50.

Up to this point, decided faith and unbelief have been only exceptional phenomena; the masses have remained in a state of passive indifference or of purely outward admiration. From this time, the situation assumes a more determinate character. Jesus continues to make known the Father, to manifest Himself as that which He is for humanity. This revelation meets with increasing hostility; the development of unbelief, becomes the predominating feature of the history. Faith indeed still manifests itself partially. But, in comparison with the powerful and rapid current which bears on the leaders and the entire body of the nation, it is like a weak and imperceptible eddy.

It is in Judea especially that this preponderant development of unbelief is accomplished. In Galilee opposition is, no doubt, also manifested; but the centre of resistance is at Jerusalem. The reason of this fact is easy to be understood. In this capital, as well as in the province of Judea which depends on it, a well-disciplined population is found, whose fanaticism is ready to support its rulers in every most violent action which their hatred may undertake. Jesus Himself depicts this situation in the Synoptics by that poignant utterance: "It cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem" (Luke xiii. 33).

This observation explains the relatively considerable place which the journeys to Jerusalem occupy in our Gospel. The general tradition, which forms the basis of the three Synoptical Gospels, was formulated with a view to the popular preaching, and to serve the ends of the apostolic mission; consequently it set in relief the facts which were connected with the foundation of faith. What had not this issue had little importance for a narrative of this kind. Now, it was in Galilee, that province which was relatively independent of the centre, that the ministry of Jesus had especially displayed its creative power and produced positive results. In this generally simple and friendly region, where Jesus found Himself no more in the presence of a systematic and powerfully organized resistance, He could preach as a simple missionary, give free scope to those discourses inspired by some scene of nature, to those happy and most appropriate words, to those gracious parables, to those teachings in connection with the immediate needs of human consciousness; in a word, to all those forms

of discourse which easily become the subject of a popular tradition. There was little engaging in discussion, properly so-called, in this region, except with emissaries coming from Judea (Matt. xv. 1–12; Mark iii. 22; vii. 1; Luke v. 17, and vi. 1–7).

At Jerusalem, on the other hand, the hostile element by which Jesus found Himself surrounded, forced Him into incessant controversy. In this situation, no doubt, the testimony which He was obliged to give for Himself took more energetic forms and a sterner tone. It became more theological, if we may so speak; consequently less popular. This character of the Judean teaching, connected with the almost complete failure of its results, was the occasion of the fact that the activity displayed at Jerusalem left scarcely any trace in the primitive oral tradition. It is for this reason, undoubtedly, that the visits to that capital almost entirely disappeared from the writings which contain it, our Synoptics. The Apostle John, who afterwards related the evangelical history, and who had in view, not the practical work of evangelization, but the preservation of the principal testimonies which Jesus bore to Himself, as well as the representation of the unbelief and faith which these testimonies encountered, was necessarily led to draw the journeys to Jerusalem out of the background where they had been left. It was these visits in the capital which had prepared the way for the final catastrophe, that supreme event the recollection of which alone the traditional narrative had preserved. Each one of these journeys had marked a new step in the hardening of Israel. Designed to form the bond between the Messianic bridegroom and bride, they had served, in fact, only to hasten that long and complete divorce between Jehovah and His people, which still continues to this hour. We can understand that, from the point of view of the fourth Gospel, the journeys to Jerusalem must have occupied a preponderant place in the narrative.

Let us cast a glance at the general course of the narrative in this part. It includes three cycles, having, each one, as its centre and point of departure, a great miracle performed in Judea: 1. The healing of the impotent man at Bethesda, chap. v.; 2. That of the one who was born blind, chap. ix.; 3. The resurrection of Lazarus, chap. xi. Each of these events, instead of gaining for Jesus the faith of those who are witnesses of it, becomes in them the signal of a renewed outbreaking of hatred and unbelief. Jesus has characterized this tragic result by the reproach, full of sadness and bitterness (x. 32): *"I have showed you many good works from my Father; for which of them do ye stone me?"* These are the connecting links of the narrative. Each one of these miraculous deeds is immediately followed by a series of conversations and discourses in connection with the *sign* which has given occasion for them; then, the discussion is suddenly interrupted by the voluntary removal of Jesus, to begin again in the following visit. Thus the strife which is entered upon in chap. v., on occasion of the healing of the impotent man, is resumed in the visit of Jesus at the feast of Tabernacles (chaps. vii. and viii.); thus also, the discourses which are connected with the healing of the one born blind are repeated, in part, and developed at the feast of dedication, in the second

part of chap. x. This arises from the fact that Jesus is careful, each time, to leave Jerusalem before things have come to the last extremity. Herein is the reason why the conflict which has broken out during one visit re-echoes also in the following one.

The following, therefore, is the arrangement of the narrative: First cycle: In chap. v., the strife, which had been vaguely hinted at in the first verses of chap. iv., commences in Judea in consequence of the healing of the impotent man; after this, Jesus withdraws into Galilee and allows the hatred of the Jews time to become calm. But in Galilee also, He finds unbelief, only in a different form. In Judea, they hate Him, they desire to put Him to death; in Galilee, His discontented adherents confine themselves to going away from Him (chap. vi.). There did not exist there the stimulant of active hatred, jealousy: unbelief arose only from the carnal spirit of the people, whose aspirations Jesus did not satisfy. With the journey to the feast of Tabernacles (chap. vii.), the conflict begun in chap. v. is resumed in Judea, and reaches in chap. viii. its highest degree of intensity. Such is the first phase (chaps. v.–viii.). Chap. ix. opens the second cycle. The healing of the one born blind furnishes new food for the hatred of the adversaries; nevertheless, in spite of their growing rage, the struggle already loses somewhat of its violence, because Jesus voluntarily withdraws from the field of battle. Up to this time, He had sought to act upon the hostile element; from this moment onward, He gives it over to itself. Only, in proportion as He breaks with the ancient flock, He labors to recruit the new one. The discourses which are connected with this second phase extend as far as the end of chap. x. The third cycle opens with the resurrection of Lazarus; this event brings to its highest point the rage of the Jews, and impels them to an extreme measure; they formally decree the death of Jesus; and, soon afterwards, His royal entrance into Jerusalem, at the head of His followers (chap. xii.), hastens the execution of this sentence. This last phase includes chaps. xi.–xii. 36. Here Jesus completely abandons Israel to its blindness, and puts an end to His public ministry: "*And departing, He hid himself from them.*" The evangelist pauses at this tragical moment, and, before continuing his narrative, he casts a retrospective glance on this mysterious fact of the development of Jewish unbelief, now consummated. He shows that this result had in it nothing unexpected, and he unveils the profound causes of it: xii. 37–50.

Thus the dominant idea and the course of this part, are distinctly outlined—

1. v.–viii.: The outbreak of the conflict;

2. ix., x.: The growing exasperation of the Jews;

3. xi., xii.: The ripe fruit of this hatred: the sentence of death for Jesus.

The progress of this narrative is purely historical. The attempt, often renewed—even by *Luthardt*—to arrange this part systematically according to certain *ideas*, such as *life*, *light* and *love*, is incompatible with this course of the narrative which is so clearly determined by the facts. It is no less

excluded by the following observations: The idea of life, which, according to this system, must be that of chaps. v. and vi., forms again the basis of chaps. x. and xi. In the interval (chaps. viii., ix.), the idea of *light* is the dominant one. That of *love* does not appear till chap. xiii., and this in an entirely different part of the Gospel. Divisions like these proceed from the laboratory of theologians, but they do not harmonize with the nature of apostolic testimony, the simple reflection of history. The real teaching of Jesus had in it nothing systematic; the Lord confined Himself to answering the given need, which was for Him, at each moment, the signal of the Father's will. If in chap. v. He represents Himself as the one who has the power to raise from the dead, spiritually and physically, it is because He has just given life to the limbs of an impotent man. If in chap. vi., He declares Himself the bread of life, it is because He has just multiplied the loaves. If in chaps. vii. and viii., He proclaims Himself the living water and the light of the world, it is because the feast of Tabernacles has just recalled to all minds the scenes of the wilderness, the water of the rock and the pillar of fire. We must go with Baur, to the extent of claiming that the facts are invented in order to illustrate the ideas, or we must renounce the attempt to find a rational arrangement in the teachings of which these events are, each time, the occasion and the text.

FIRST CYCLE.

V.–VIII.

This cycle contains three sections:

1. Chap. v. The beginning of the conflict in Judea;
2. Chap. vi. The crisis of faith in Galilee;
3. Chaps. vii., viii. The renewal and continuation of the conflict in Judea.

From chap. v. to chap. viii. we must reckon a period of seven or eight months. Indeed, if we are not in error, the event related in chap. v. occurred at the feast of Purim, consequently in the month of March. The story of the multiplication of the loaves, chap. vi., transports us to the time of the Passover, thus to April; and ch. vii. to the feast of Tabernacles, thus to October. If to this quite considerable period we add some previous months, which had passed since the month of December of the preceding year, when Jesus had returned to Galilee (iv. 35), we arrive at a continuous sojourn in that region of nearly ten months (December to October), which was interrupted only by the short journey to Jerusalem in chap. v. It is strange that of this ten months' Galilean activity, John mentions only a single event: the multiplication of the loaves (chap. vi.). Is it not natural to conclude from this silence, that, in this space of time left by John as a blank, the greater part of the facts of the Galilean ministry related by the Synoptics are to be placed. The multiplication of the loaves is, as it were, the *connecting link* between the two narratives.

FIRST SECTION.

V. 1–47.

First Outbreak of Hatred in Judea.

1. The miracle, occasion of the conflict: vv. 1–16; 2. The discourse of Jesus, commentary and defense of the miracle: vv. 17–47.

I.—*The miracle:* vv. 1–16.

Ver. 1. "*After these things, there was a feast*[1] *of the Jews, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem.*" The connecting phrase μετὰ ταῦτα, *after these things*, does not seem to us to indicate, notwithstanding the examples cited by *Meyer*, as immediate a succession as does μετὰ τοῦτο, *after this*. Whatever may be the feast to which we refer the event which is about to be related, it must have been separated by quite a long interval from the previous return. In fact, the feast which followed next after that return (in the course of December), that of the Dedication, at the end of this month, cannot be the one in question here. Jesus would not have returned to Judea so soon after He had left it for the reason indicated in iv. 1. After this came the feast of Purim in March, then that of the Passover in April. If the article ἡ before ἑορτή, "*the* feast," is read, the meaning is not doubtful; the latter feast is the one in question; for it was the principal one among the Jewish festivals, and the one best known to Greek readers (vi. 4). But why should such a large number of documents have omitted the article, if it was authentic? We can much more easily understand the reason for its addition; it was supposed that the question was precisely of the Passover. If the article is rejected, not only is there no further evidence in favor of this feast, but it is even positively excluded. More than this, it would be excluded even with the article. For why should not John, who elsewhere names it distinctly, do the same here? Comp. ii. 13; vi. 4; xi. 55, etc. Moreover, immediately afterwards, the narrative speaks to us, vi. 4, of a Passover during which Jesus remains in Galilee. We should, therefore, be obliged to suppose that between chaps. v. and vi. a whole year elapsed, of which John does not say a single word—a very improbable supposition. Besides, in chap. vii. (vv. 19–24), Jesus reverts to the healing of the impotent man which is related in chap. v., for the purpose of justifying it; would He have proceeded thus with respect to it after an interval of more than a year? Chap. iv. (ver. 35) placed us in the month of December; chap. vi. (ver. 4) points to the month of April. Between these two dates, it is quite natural to think of the feast of Purim, which was celebrated in March. This feast had reference to the deliverance of the Jews by queen Esther. It was not, it is true, of Divine institution, like the three great

[1] T. R. reads εορτη (*a* feast) with A B D G K S U V Γ Δ Mnn. Ir. Or. Chrys. and Tisch. (ed. of 1859); the article η before εορτη (*the* feast) is read by ℵ C E F H L M Δ Π 50 Mnn. Cop. Sah. some Fathers, Tisch. (8th ed.)

feasts; but why should this fact have prevented Jesus from going to it, as He did to the feast of Dedication (chap. x.) which was in the same case? And the expression: *a feast*, is exactly explained by this circumstance. As it was much less known than the others, outside of the Jewish people, and as by reason of its political character it had lost all importance for the Christian Church, it was needless to name it. Against this feast is alleged that it was not specially celebrated at Jerusalem. It consisted, in fact, in the reading of the book of Esther in every synagogue, and at banquets which took place throughout the country. But Jesus may have gone to Judea at that time with the intention of remaining there until the Passover feast, which was to be celebrated soon afterwards. The conflict that occurred on occasion of the healing of the impotent man was that which forced Him to return sooner to Galilee. Although, therefore, *de Wette* pronounces his verdict by declaring, "that there is not a single good reason to allege in favor of the feast of Purim," it appears to me that everything speaks in favor of this interpretation, which is that of *Hug*, *Olshausen*, *Wieseler*, *Meyer*, *Lange*, *Gess*, *Weiss*, etc. *Irenæus*, *Luther*, *Grotius*, *Lampe*, *Neander*, *Hengstenberg*, etc., decide in favor of the Passover. *Chrysostom*, *Calvin*, *Bengel*, *Hilgenfeld*, etc., give the preference to Pentecost. The absence of the article and of a precise designation speak against the second supposition, as well as against the first. Besides, between v. 1 (Pentecost) and vi. 4 (Passover of the following year), a period of more than ten months would have to be placed, respecting which John kept complete silence. *Ebrard*, *Ewald*, *Lichtenstein*, *Riggenbach* (doubtfully), pronounce for the feast of Tabernacles. This supposition is quite as improbable; for this feast is expressly named vii. 2: ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ἡ σκηνοπηγία. Why should it not be named here, as well as there? *Westcott* thinks of the feast of trumpets, on the first of the month *Tisri*, which opened the civil year of the Hebrews. It is on this day that the Rabbis fix the creation of the world and the last judgment. This day was solemnly announced by the sound of the sacerdotal trumpets. But can we suppose that a whole year elapsed between chap. v. and chap. vii., where we find ourselves again in the month of October? *Lücke*, *de Wette*, *Luthardt*, regard any determination of the point as impossible.

This question has more importance than appears at the first glance. If we refer v. 1 to the feast of Purim, as we believe we should, the framework of the history of Jesus is contracted: two years and a half are sufficient to include all its dates: ii. 13 Passover (1st year); iv. 35, December (same year); v. 1, Purim, March (2d year); vi. 4, Passover (April); vii. 1, Tabernacles (October); x. 22, Dedication (December); xii. 1, Passover, April (3d year). If, on the other hand, v. 1 designates a Passover feast, or one of those which followed it in the Jewish year, we are necessarily led to extend the duration of Jesus' ministry to three years and a half. *Gess* places this journey of Jesus at the time of the mission of the Twelve in Galilee (Matt. xi. 1; Mark vi. 7); this circumstance would explain why Jesus repaired to Judea alone or almost alone. This combination has nothing impossible in it (see on ver. 13). Has not Beyschlag good grounds for

alleging in favor of John's narrative the very naturally articulated course of the history of Jesus which appears in it: Judea, chap. i.; Galilee, chap. ii.a; Judea, chap. ii.b. iii.; Samaria, chap. iv.a; Galilee, chap. iv.b; Judea, chap. v.; Galilee, chap. vi.; Judea, chap. x., etc., in opposition to the strongly-marked contrast, without transition, which the Synoptical narrative presents: Galilee, Judea?

Ver. 2. "*Now there is at Jerusalem, by*[1] *the sheep-gate,*[2] *a pool called*[3] *in Hebrew, Bethesda,*[4] *having five porches.*" The Sinaitic MS. rejects the words ἐπὶ τῇ, *by the*, and thus makes the adjective προβατικῇ, *pertaining to sheep*, the epithet of κολυμβήθρᾳ: *the reservoir* or *the pool for sheep*. This reading is too weakly supported to be adopted, even in the view of *Tischendorf*. We must, therefore, understand as the substantive belonging with the adjective προβατικῇ, *pertaining to sheep*, one of the substantives, πύλῃ, *gate*, or ἀγορᾷ, *market*. The passages in Nehemiah, iii. 1–32; xii. 39, where a *sheep-gate* is mentioned, favor the former of these two ellipses. In Neh. iii. 3, mention is made of a *fish-gate* as near the preceding; it is probable that these two gates derived their names from the adjacent markets. The sheep-gate must have been situated on the side of the valley of Jehoshaphat, on the east of the city. As *Bovet* says, "the small cattle which entered Jerusalem came there certainly by the east; for it is on this side that the immense pastures of the wilderness of Judea lie." *Riehm's* Dictionary also says: "Even at the present day, it is through this gate that the Bedouins lead their flocks to Jerusalem for sale." The *sheep-gate*, as *Hengstenberg* observes, according to Neh. xii. 39, 40, must have been quite near the Temple; for it is from this that, in the ceremony of the inauguration of the walls, the cortege of priests entered immediately into the sacred inclosure. The gate, called at the present day St. Stephen's, at the northeast angle of the Haram, answers to these data. *M. de Saulcy* (*Voyage autour de la mer Morte*, t. II. pp. 367, 368) holds, according to some passages of St. Jerome and of authors of the Middle Ages, that there were in this place two neighboring pools, and supplying, in thought, κολυμβήθρᾳ, he explains: "Near the *sheep-pool*, there is *the pool* called Bethesda." In spite of the triumphant tone[5] with which this explanation is proposed, it is inadmissible. The expression of the evangelist, thus understood, would suppose this alleged *sheep-pool*, which is nowhere mentioned in the Old Testament, to be known to his Greek readers. *Meyer*, accepting the reading of the Sinaitic MS. τὸ λεγόμενον ἑβραιστὶ Βηθζάθα, explains: "There is near the *sheep-pool the place* called in Hebrew, Bethzatha." But a place so com-

[1] Instead of επι, A D G L read εν.

[2] ℵ Vulg^{all}. some Mnn. reject επι τῃ. Syr^{cur}. Syr^{sch}. Cyr. omit επι τῃ προβατικῃ.

[3] Instead of η επιλεγομενη, ℵ reads το λεγομενον, D V Mnn. λεγομενῃ.

[4] Instead of Βηθεσδα, ℵ L 1 Mnn. read Βηθζαθα Eus. Βηζαθα, B. Vulg. Βηθσαιδα, D Βελζεθα.

[5] The following are his expressions: "It is very curious to see how the commentators have made incredible efforts to understand this verse . . . . They have all been equally happy in their suppositions; it was the word κολυμβήθρα which needed to be understood, and all became clear." M. de Saulcy holds that, according to Brocardus, the second pool was situated west of the first. But the passage quoted would rather prove that it must have been to the north.

pletely unknown as the sheep-pool could not be indicated as a determining-point to Greek readers. The feminine ἔχουσα which follows is, besides, hardly favorable to this reading, which is only an awkward correction, like so many others which are met with in this manuscript. *Weiss* makes κολυμβήθρᾳ, a dative, and thinks that the best subject to be supplied is οἰκίᾳ, *the building Bethesda;* this ellipsis seems to me very unnatural. *Bengel* and *Lange* have concluded from the present ἐστι, *there is*, that the Gospel was written before the destruction of Jerusalem. But this present may be inspired by the vividness of recollection. Besides, an establishment of this kind belongs to the nature of the place and may survive a catastrophe. *Tobler* (*Denkblätter*, pp. 53 ff.), has proved that, in the fifth century, the porches here spoken of were still pointed out. *Hengstenberg* concludes from the ἐπί, *upon*, in the word ἐπιλεγομένη, "*sur*named," that the pool bore also another name. But it is more simple to suppose that John regards the word *pool* as the name, and *Bethesda* as the *sur*name. The expression: *in Hebrew*, denotes the Aramaic dialect, which had become the popular language since the return from the captivity. The most natural etymology of the word *Bethesda* is certainly *beth-chêseda, house of mercy*, whether this name alludes to the munificence of some pious Jew who had had these porches constructed to shelter the sick, or whether it refers to the goodness of God, from which this healing spring proceeded. *Delitzsch* has supposed that the etymology may be *beth-estaw* (אסטין) *peristyle. Beth-Aschada* (אשרא) *place of outpouring* (of the blood of victims), has also been thought of. The Alexandrian and Greco-Latin variants are only gross corruptions (see those of B and D). It might be supposed that these porches were five isolated buildings, arranged in a circle around the pool. But it is more simple to imagine a single edifice, forming a pentagonal peristyle, in the centre of which was the reservoir. There are still known at the present day, in the eastern part of the city of Jerusalem, some springs of mineral water; among others, on the west of the inclosure of the Temple, in the Mahometan quarter, the baths of *Aïn-es-Schefa* (*Ritter*, 16th part, p. 387). *Tobler* has proved that this spring is fed by the large chamber of water situated under the mosque which has replaced the temple. Another better known spring is found at the foot of the southeastern slope of Moriah; it is called *the Virgin-spring*. We have two principal accounts respecting this pond, those of *Tobler* and *Robinson*. The spring is very intermittent. The basin is sometimes entirely dry; again, the water is seen springing up between the stones. On the 21st of January, 1845, Tobler saw the water rise four and a half inches, with a gentle undulation. On the 14th of March, it rose for more than twenty minutes to the height of six or seven inches, and in two minutes sank again to its previous level. Robinson saw the water rise a foot in five minutes. A woman assured him that this movement is repeated at certain times, two or three times a day, but that in summer it is often observed only once in two or three days. These phenomena present a certain analogy to what is related of the spring of Bethesda. *Eusebius* also speaks of springs existing in this locality whose water was reddish. This color,

which evidently arises from mineral elements, was, according to him, due to the infiltration of the blood of victims. Tradition places the pool of Bethesda in a great square hollow, surrounded by walls and situated to the north of the Haram, southward of the street which leads from St. Stephen's gate. It is called *Birket-Israïl;* it has a depth of about twenty-one meters, a breadth of about forty, and a length more than twice as great. The bottom is dry, filled with grass and shrubs. Robinson supposed that it was a fosse, formerly belonging to the fortifications of the citadel of Antonia. This supposition is rejected by several competent authorities. However this may be, Bethesda must have been nearly in this locality, for it is here that the sheep-gate (see above) was situated. As it is impossible to identify the pool of Bethesda with any one of the thermal springs of which we have just spoken, it must have been covered with débris, or have disappeared, as happens so frequently with intermittent fountains. The springs which are found at the present day merely prove how favorable the soil is to this kind of phenomena.[1]

Vv. 3, 4. "*In these porches lay a great number of sick persons, blind, lame, withered,*[2] [*waiting for the movement of the water.*[3] 4. *For an angel descended from time to time into the pool and troubled the water; whosoever then first entered in after the troubling of the water, was healed of whatever disease he had*]."[4] The spectacle which this portico surrounding the pool presented is reproduced in some sort *de visu* by *Bovet*, describing the baths of Ibrahim, near Tiberias: "The hall where the spring is found is surrounded by several porticos, in which we see a multitude of people crowded one upon another, laid upon pallets or rolled in blankets, with lamentable expressions of misery and suffering. . . . . The pool is of white marble, of circular form and covered by a cupola supported by columns; the basin is surrounded on the interior by a bench on which persons may sit." Ξηροί, *impotent*, properly denotes those who have some member affected with atrophy, or, according to the common expression, *wasting away*. The end of ver. 3 and the 4th verse are wanting in the larger part of the Alexandrian MSS., and are rejected by *Tischendorf*, *Lücke*, *Tholuck*, *Olshausen*, *Meyer*. The large number of variants and the indications of doubt by which this passage is marked in several MSS., favor the rejection. The defenders of the authenticity of the passage, for example *Reuss*, explain the omission of it by the Alexandrian authorities by a dogmatic antipathy which, they hold, betrayed itself in the similar omission Luke xxii.

[1] Josephus *Bell. Jud.* (not *Antiqq.*, as Meyer says through an error), x. 5. 4, speaks of two pools called *Strouthion* and *Amygdalon;* the former near the citadel of Antonia on the northwest of the temple; the latter at the north of the temple. Bethesda must have been situated not far from these, towards the northeast corner.

[2] D a b add to ξηρων: παραλυτικων.

[3] ℵ A B C L Syr^{cur} Sah. some Mnn. omit the ending of ver. 3 from εκδεχομενον (*waiting*) inclusively. This ending is read in D I Γ Δ Λ Π and nine other Mjj. Mnn. It. Syr^{sch}.

[4] The whole of ver. 4 is rejected by ℵ B C D It^{aliq} Syr^{cur} Sah. some Mnn. Besides this, the text presents in the other MSS. an exceptional number of variants; instead of γαρ: και (L It^{aliq}); instead of αγγελος: αγγελος κυριου (A K L It^{aliq} Vulg. 30 Mnn.); instead of κατεβαινεν: ελουετο (A K Π): instead of ταρασσε: ταρασσετο (several Mjj.); etc.

43, 44 (the appearance of the angel at Gethsemane). This supposition would not, by any means, apply either to the *Sinaitic* MS., which has the passage in Luke entire, or to the *Alexandrian* which, in our passage, reads the fourth verse. The *Vatican* MS., alone presents the two omissions together; which evidently is not enough to justify the suspicion expressed above. I held with Ewald, in my earlier editions, that the true reading is the one presented by the *Cambridge* MS., and by numerous MSS. of the *Itala*, which preserve the close of ver. 3 while omitting the whole of ver. 4. The words: *waiting for the movement of the water*, if they are authentic, may indeed easily have occasioned the gloss of ver. 4. And ver. 7 seems to demand, in what precedes, something like the last words of ver. 3. Still it seems to me difficult to understand what should have occasioned the omission of these words in so large a number of documents, if they had originally formed part of the text. I am inclined, therefore, to hold with *Weiss*, *Keil*, etc., that they, as well as ver. 4, were added. The whole was at first written on the margin by a copyist; then this marginal remark was introduced into the text, as is observed in so many cases. This interpolation must be very ancient, for it is found already in one of the Syriac Versions (Syr^{sch}), and *Tertullian* seems to allude to it (*de Bapt.*, c. 5). It was the expression of the popular opinion respecting the periodical movement of the water. According to the authentic text, there is nothing supernatural in the phenomenon of Bethesda. The whole is reduced to the intermittence which is so frequently observed in thermal waters. It is known that these waters have the greatest efficacy at the moment when they spring up, set in ebullition by the increased action of the gas, and it was at this moment that each sick person tried to be the first to feel its influence. *Hengstenberg*, who admits the intervention of the angel, extends the same explanation to all thermal waters. But it would be necessary, in this case, to hold a singular exaggeration in the terms of ver. 4. For after all no mineral water instantaneously heals the sick and all the kinds of maladies which are here mentioned.

Vv. 5–7. "*There was a man there,*[1] *held by his*[2] *sickness for thirty-eight years.* 6. *When Jesus saw him lying,*[3] *and knew that he had been already sick for a long time, he said unto him: Dost thou wish to be healed?* 7. *The sick man answered him: Sir,*[4] *I have no one, when the water is troubled, to put*[5] *me into the pool; and while I am coming, another goes down before me.*" The long continuance of the malady is mentioned, either to set forth how inveterate and difficult to heal it was, or rather, according to ver. 6, to explain the profound compassion with which Jesus was moved on beholding this unhappy man. Ἔχων might be taken in the intransitive sense (ἀσθενῶς ἔχειν); but the construction is so similar to that of ver. 6, where χρόνον is the object of ἔχει, that it is preferable to make ἔτη the

[1] ℵ alone omits εκει.

[2] ℵ B C D L It^{plerique} some Mnn. read (after ασθενεια) αυτου, which is omitted by T. R. with A I Γ Δ Λ Π and 9 other Mjj.

[3] ℵ alone reads ανακειμενον.

[4] E F G H Syr^{sch} some Mnn. read ναι (*yes*) before κυριε.

[5] T. R. reads βαλλη with some Mnn. only; all the Mjj. read βαλη.

object of ἔχων: "Having thirty-eight years in this condition of sickness." One has what one suffers. It is not necessary to connect ἔχων closely with ἦν ἐκεῖ, as if John meant to say that the sick person *had been there* for thirty-eight years.

Jesus appears here suddenly, as it were coming forth from a sort of *incognito*. What a difference between this arrival without éclat and His entrance into the Temple at the first Passover, ii. 13 ff.! Here it is no longer the Messiah; it is a simple pilgrim. *Meyer* translates γνούς: *having learned*, as if Jesus had received information. *Weiss* thinks that he heard the fact from the lips of the sick man himself. This meaning is possible; γνούς may, however, indicate one of those instantaneous perceptions by which the truth revealed itself to Jesus in the degree which was demanded by His task at the moment. Comp. i. 49; iv. 17. The 14th verse will show that the entire life of the sick man is present to the view of Jesus. The *long time* recalls the thirty-eight years of ver. 5: in this way is the identity of construction explained. The feast of Purim was celebrated among the Jews by works of beneficence and mutual gifts. It was the day of largesses. On Purim-day, said a Jew, nothing is refused to children. Jesus enters into the spirit of the feast, as He does also in chaps. vi. and vii., as regards the rites of the feasts of the Passover and of Tabernacles. His compassion, awakened by the sight of this man lying ill and abandoned (*lying on a couch*), and by the inward contemplation of the life of suffering which had preceded this moment (*already*), impels him to bestow largess also and spontaneously to accomplish for him a work of mercy. His question: "*Dost thou wish to be healed?*" is an implicit promise. Jesus endeavors thus, as *Lange* says, to draw the sick man from the dark discouragement in which this long and useless waiting had plunged him, and to reanimate hope within him. At the same time, Jesus by means of this question wishes to turn away His thought from the means of healing on which it was exclusively fixed, and to give him a perception of a new means, the living being who is to become for him the true Bethesda. Comp. the similar words of Peter to the impotent man, Acts iii. 4: "*Look on us.*" Faith, awakened by his look fixed upon Him who is speaking to him, will be, as it were, the channel through which the force from above will penetrate within him. The answer of the sick man does not imply the authenticity of ver. 4, nor even necessarily that of the end of ver. 3. It is sufficiently explained by the fact, known or easy to understand, of the intermittent ebullition of the spring. We see by the words: *I have no one*, that he was solitary and poor.

Vv. 8, 9. "*Jesus saith unto him: Arise,*[1] *take up thy bed,*[2] *and walk.* 9. *And immediately*[3] *the man was healed,*[4] *and he took up his bed, and walked. Now that day was a Sabbath.*" The word κράββατος comes from the Macedonian dialect (*Passow*); it is written in different ways. The imperfect *he walked* dramatically paints the joy in the recovered power.

[1] T. R. reads εγειραι with U V Γ Δ Mnn.; the rest: εγειρε.

[2] T. R. with V and several Mnn.: κραββατον; 17 Mjj.: κραβαττον; ℵ: κραβακτον; E: κραβατον.

[3] ℵ D only omit ευθεως.

[4] ℵ Ita,b,q add here και ηγερθη (*and arose*).

Vv. 10–13. "*The Jews therefore said unto him who had been healed: It is the Sabbath; it is not lawful for thee to carry thy bed.* 11. *He answered*[1] *them: He that healed me said unto me: Take up thy bed, and walk.*[2] 12. *They asked him therefore: who is the man who said unto thee: Take up thy bed and walk?* 13. *But he that was healed*[3] *knew not who it was; for Jesus had disappeared*[4] *as there was a multitude in the place.*"[5] The act of carrying his bed seemed to the Jews a violation of the Sabbath rest. The Rabbis distinguished three sorts of works interdicted on the Sabbath, among them that of carrying a piece of furniture. The Rabbinical statute also prohibited treating a sick person medically, and perhaps the term τεθεραπευμένος (*cared for, treated*), contains an allusion to this other no less heavy grievance. But the fault of the Jews was in identifying the rabbinical explanation of the fourth commandment with its real meaning. The sick man very logically places his action under the protection of Him who miraculously has given him the power to perform it. The question of the Jews (ver. 12) is very characteristic. It is reproduced with much accuracy and nicety. They do not ask: "Who healed thee?" The fact of the miracle, though surprising enough, affects them very slightly. But the contravention of their Sabbatic statute, this is what is worthy of attention. Here is, indeed, the spirit of the Ἰουδαῖοι (ver. 10). The aorist ἰαθείς (*healed*), differing from τεθεραπευμένος (*cared for*), sets forth prominently the moment when the sick man, having gained the consciousness of his cure, looked about for His benefactor without being able to find Him. The reading adopted by *Tischendorf* (ὁ ἀσθενῶν) has no intrinsic value, and is not sufficiently sustained. The design of Jesus in withdrawing so speedily was to avoid the noise and the flocking together of a multitude; He feared the carnal enthusiasm which His miracles were exciting. But it does not follow from this, that the last words: "*as there was a crowd in the place,*" are intended to express this motive. They rather set forth, as *Hengstenberg* thinks, the possibility of escape. Jesus had easily disappeared in the midst of the crowd which was thronging the place. This is, undoubtedly, the meaning which the reading of the *Sinaitic* MS. is designed to express: ἐν μέσῳ (*in the midst of*); it is inadmissible, as well as the other variant of the same MS. in this verse (ἐνευσεν).—Ἐκνεύω, strictly: *to make a motion of the head* in order to avoid a blow, hence: to escape. The aorist has certainly here the sense of the pluperfect (against *Meyer* and *Weiss*). From this slight detail, *Gess* concludes that Jesus was not accompanied by His disciples in this visit to Jerusalem, and that they were at this time accomplishing their mission in Galilee.

Vv. 14, 15. "*Afterward, Jesus finds him*[6] *in the temple and said to him: Behold, thou art made whole; sin no more, lest a worse thing befall thee.* 15. *The*

[1] Instead of απεκριθη, A B: ος δε (C G K L Δ: ο δε) απεκριθη; ℵ: ο δε απεκρινατο.

[2] Instead of αρον and περιπατει, ℵ reads in this verse and the following αραι and περιπατειν. ℵ B C L omit τον κραββατον σου.

[3] Instead of ιαθεις, Tisch. reads ασθενων with D It.[g] only.

[4] ℵ D read ενευσεν (*made a sign*) instead of εξενευσεν.

[5] ℵ alone: μεσω instead of τοπω

[6] ℵ Syr[cu] τον τεθεραπευμενον instead of αυτον.

man went away and told[1] *the Jews that it was Jesus who had healed him.*" The sick man had, undoubtedly, come into the temple to pray or offer a thank-offering. The warning which Jesus addresses to him certainly implies that his malady had been the effect of some particular sin; but we need not infer from this that every malady results from an individual and special sin; it may have as its cause, in many cases, the debasement of the collective life of humanity by means of sin (see on ix. 3). By *something worse* than thirty-eight years of suffering, Jesus can scarcely mean anything but damnation.

In the revelation which the impotent man gives to the Jews, we need not see either a communication dictated by thankfulness and the desire to bring the Jews to faith (*Chrysostom, Grotius*, etc.), nor an ill-disposed denunciation (*Schleiermacher, Lange*), nor an act of obedience to the Jewish authorities (*Lücke, de Wette, Luthardt*), nor, finally, the bold desire of making known to them a power superior to their own (*Meyer*). It is quite simply the reply which he was not able to give, at ver. 13, and which he now gives to discharge his own responsibility; for he remained himself under the complaint so long as he could not refer it to the author of the act, and this violation of the Sabbath might draw upon him the penalty of death (vv. 16, 18); comp. Num., xv. 35.

Ver. 16. "*For this cause did the Jews persecute Jesus,*[2] *because he did these things on the Sabbath day.*" Διὰ τοῦτο (*for this cause*), resumes what precedes, and, at the same time, is explained by the phrase which closes the verse: *because . . .* The word διώκειν (*persecute*), indicates the seeking of the means to injure. In favor of the authenticity of the following words in the T. R.: *and they sought to kill him*, the μᾶλλον (*yet more*), of ver. 18, can be alleged. But it is still more probable that it is these words in ver. 18 which have occasioned this interpolation. The imperfect ἐποίει (*He did*), malignantly expresses the idea that the violation of the Sabbath has henceforth passed with Him into a rule: He is accustomed to do it. This idea is entirely lost in the inaccurate translation of Ostervald and of Rilliet: "because He *had done this.*" The plural ταῦτα (*these things*), refers to the double violation of the Sabbath, the healing and the bearing of the burden.

Let us notice here two analogies between John and the Synoptics: 1. In the latter also, Jesus is often obliged to perform His miracles as it were by stealth, and even to impose silence on those whom He has healed. 2. It is on occasion of the Sabbatic healings wrought in Galilee, that, according to them also, the conflict breaks out (Luke vi. 1–11).

II. *The discourse of Jesus:* vv. 17–47.

In this discourse which is designed to vindicate the act which He has just performed, the three following thoughts are developed:

[1] Instead of ανηγγειλε, D G U Δ 20 Mnn. read απηγγειλε; ℵ C L Syr Cop ειπεν.

[2] T. R. adds here και εζητουν αυτον αποκτειναι with 12 Mjj.; the larger part of the Mnn.; It[2]; Syr[sch]. These words are omitted in ℵ B C D L It[plerique]; Vulg.; Syr[cur]; Cop.

1. Jesus justifies His work by the *perfect subordination* which exists between His activity and that of His Father: vv. 17–30.

2. The reality of this relation does not rest solely on the personal affirmation of Jesus; it has as its guarantee the *testimony of God Himself*: vv. 31–40.

3. Supported by this testimony of the Father, Jesus passes from defense to attack and unveils to the Jews the moral *cause* of their unbelief, the absence of the true spirit of the law: vv. 41–47.

I. *The Son the Father's workman*: vv. 17–30.

Ver. 17. "*Jesus answered them: My Father worketh until now, and I work.*" The aorist middle ἀπεκρίνατο is found only here and in ver. 19; perhaps also xii. 23. Its use may be occasioned by the personal, apologetic character of the following discourse. This utterance, like that of ii. 19 (comp. Luke ii. 49), is like a flash of light breaking forth from the inmost depths of the consciousness of Jesus, from the point of mysterious union where He inwardly receives the Father's impulse. These sudden and immeasurably profound outbreakings of thought distinguish the language of Jesus from all other language.

These words are ordinarily explained in this sense: "My Father works *continually* (that is without allowing Himself to stop on the Sabbath), and, for myself, I work in the same way, without being bound by the legal statute;" either in that this declaration is applied to the work of God in the preservation of the universe, when once the creation is finished, (*Reuss*), or in that it is referred to the work of the salvation of humanity, which admits of no interruption (*Meyer*). In both cases, Jesus would affirm that He is no more subjected, as a man, to the obligation of the Sabbatic rest, than is God Himself. But if this were, indeed, His thought, He would not have said: *until this very hour* (ἕως ἄρτι), but *always, continually* (ἀεί). This objection is the more serious, because, according to the position of the words, this adverb of time, and not the verb, has the emphasis. Then, in the second member of the sentence, Jesus could not have refrained from either repeating the adverb or substituting for it the word ὁμοίως, *in the same way*; "And I also work continually, or likewise." Besides, it would have been very easy to answer to this argument that the position of a man with regard to the Sabbatic commandment is not the same with that of God. Finally the declaration of Jesus, thus understood, would contradict the attitude of submission to the law which He constantly observed during His life. Born a Jew, He lived as a faithful Jew. He emancipated Himself, undoubtedly, from the yoke of human commandments and Pharisaic traditions, but never from that of the law itself. It is impossible to prove in the life of Jesus a single contravention of a truly legal prescription. Death alone freed Him from this yoke. Such is the impression which He left, that St. Paul says of Him (Gal. iv. 4): "*born under the law*," and characterizes His whole life by the expression (Rom. xv. 8): "*minister of the circumcision*." *Luthardt* has fully per-

ceived the special sense which the adverb ἕως ἄρτι, *until this hour*, must have. He has had the idea of contrasting it, not with the Sabbatic institution, but with the final Sabbath yet to come: "Since up to this time the work of salvation has not been consummated, as it will be in the future Sabbath, and consequently my Father works still, I also work." This sense is certainly much nearer to the thought of Jesus; only the antithesis between the present Sabbath and the Sabbath to come is not indicated by anything in the text.

To apprehend thoroughly the meaning of this utterance, let us for a moment set aside the words ἕως ἄρτι, until this hour. Jesus says: "My Father works, and I also work." The relation between these two propositions is obvious. We easily understand that it is necessary to combine logically what is grammatically in juxtaposition, and that it is as if it were: "*Since* my Father works, I also work." The Son cannot remain idle when the Father is working. We find again here that paratactic construction which is conformed to the genius of the Hebrew language, and which expresses by the simple copula, *and*, one of the numerous logical relations which the genius of the Greek states with precision by means of some other conjunction; comp. i. 10, ii. 9, etc. Nothing is changed in this relation by the addition of the adverb ἕως ἄρτι, *until this hour*. The meaning becomes the following: "Since my Father works *up to this moment*, I also work." *Passow*, in his Dictionary, remarks that in Greek, especially in the later writers, ἄρτι following καί, as is the case here, serves to indicate the immediate and rapid succession of two states; thus in this sentence: ἄρτι ἀπείργαστο τὸ ἄσμα καὶ ἀπῆλθεν (*the song was no sooner finished than he departed*). This is precisely the relation of immediate succession which Jesus affirms here as the law of His activity, as the true relation between His Father's work and His own, from which He draws the justification of the miracle which had been made the subject of incrimination. *Westcott*, *Weiss* and *Keil* are unwilling to see here an idea of *subordination;* they claim that the work of the Son is much rather *co-ordinated* with that of the Father. But this alleged co-ordination would not justify Jesus; for, as we have already said, the position of a man cannot be compared to that of God. We must reach the point of *dependence* in order that the argument may avail. And this relation of dependence it is, indeed, which appears from the relation between the two propositions: "Since my Father works until this moment, I also work." In order to grasp the meaning of this word, at once simple and profound, it is sufficient to imagine Jesus working with Joseph in the carpenter's shop at Nazareth. Can we not readily understand the reply which He would have addressed to the one who wished to turn Him aside from the work: "My Father works until now, and I also [consequently] cannot cease to work." Jesus finds Himself now with His Heavenly Father in a vaster workshop; He sees God at work in the theocracy and in the whole world, occupied with working for the salvation of mankind, and He suits His own local and personal working to this immense work. This is what He has just done in healing the impotent man; this modest healing is a link

in the great chain suspended from His Father's hand, a real factor in the work which God is accomplishing here on earth. The development of this thought will follow in vv. 19, 20.

The meaning, therefore, is not: "I, as truly as God, have the right to work on the Sabbath;" but: "I have done nothing but obey the signal which God gave me at the moment . . . " Jesus sets forth, not the continuity of His working, but his filial and devoted adaptation to the work of the Father. And if objection is made that this amounts to the same thing, since God might direct Him to work even on the Sabbath, the answer is easy. God will not direct him to do anything which is contrary to the position of Jew, which He has imposed upon Him for the time of His earthly life. And He has done this none the more in this case, since neither the way in which Jesus healed the impotent man, nor the return of the latter to His dwelling, carrying his bed, really fell under the prohibition of the Mosaic law, as rightly understood. *Hilgenfeld* has gone even so far as to see in this saying of the Gospel an *intentional* contradiction of the idea of the rest of God in Genesis. But the rest in Genesis refers to the work of God in the sphere of nature, while the question here is of the divine work for the salvation of the human race. Is there here, as is affirmed, pretentious metaphysics? No. It is the deepest foundation of the peculiar filial life of Jesus, which all at once appears in this marvelously concise saying. The life of Socrates presents a phenomenon which has some analogy to that of which we have just had a glimpse. His *genius* arrested him when he was on the point of acting contrary to the will of the gods. But what a distance between this purely negative action and the positive divine impulse to which Jesus attaches His whole work! And what an appropriateness in this saying, what an imposing apology! It was to say to His adversaries: In accusing me, it is the Father whom you accuse. It is the legislator Himself whom you reproach with the transgression of the law; for I only act on a signal received from Him. We can understand, however, how this saying, instead of pacifying the adversaries, was only like the drop of oil thrown upon the fire, and caused their rage to overflow.

Ver. 18. "*For this reason*[1] *the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only broke the Sabbath, but called God his own Father, making himself equal with God.*" The διὰ τοῦτο (*for this reason*), is explained by the ὅτι (*because*), which follows. We have seen, that according to the genuine text in ver. 16, the intention *to kill* Jesus had not yet been ascribed to His enemies; it was only implicitly contained in the word ἐδίωκον (*they persecuted*). This suffices to explain the μᾶλλον (*yet more*) of ver. 18. Let us notice here the singular exaggerations of *Reuss*: "Let one read," he says, "the discourse, ver. 18 ff., many times interrupted by the phrase: *They persecute him, they seek to kill him.* According to the common and purely historical exegesis, we reach the picture of the Jews running after Jesus in the streets and pursuing Him with showers of stones" (t. ii., p. 416). The

[1] ℵ D It.: διατουτο ουν; the rest omit ουν.

fact is, that the simple historical exegesis, which does not of set purpose go into error, does not find in these expressions: "*They persecuted Him*" (ver. 16), "*they sought to kill Him*" (ver. 18), anything else than the indication of some hostile secret meetings in which the rulers asked themselves, even then, how they could get rid of so dangerous a man. The Synoptics trace back also to this epoch the murderous projects of the adversaries of Jesus (Luke vi. 7, 11; Mark iii. 6; Matt. xii. 14). The anxious look of John was able to discern the fruit in the germ.—Ἔλυε, not: *He had violated* (*Ostervald*); but (imperfect): *He broke*, strictly: *dissolved*. His example and His principles seemed to annihilate the Sabbath. Besides this first complaint, the declaration of Jesus in ver. 17 had just furnished them a second—that of blaspheming. It was, first of all, the word μοῦ (*my* Father), which shocked them because of the special and exclusive sense which this expression assumed in the mouth of Jesus. If He had said *Our Father*, the Jews would have accepted the saying without displeasure (viii. 41). It was, in addition, the practical consequences which he seemed to draw from the term, making the working of God the standard of His own, and thus making Himself equal with God.

The 17th verse contains the primal idea of the whole following discourse: the relation of subordination between the activity of the Father and that of the Son. Vv. 19, 20, set forth this idea in a more detailed way; in ver. 19, the relation of the Son's action to that of the Father; in ver. 20, the relation of the Father's action to that of the Son. We might say: the Son who puts himself with fidelity at the service of the Father (ver. 19), and the Father who condescends to direct the activity of the Son (ver. 20).

Ver. 19. "*Jesus therefore answered and said unto them*[1]*: Verily, verily,*[2] *I say unto you: the Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father doing. For the things which he doeth, these doeth the Son also in like manner.*" The interpreters who find a speculative idea in ver. 17, such as that of continuous creation, see in vv. 19, 20, the unfolding of the metaphysical relation between the Father and the Logos. But if one gives to ver. 17, as we have done, a sense appropriate to the context, vv. 19, 20 do not have this more or less abstract theological character; they, as well as ver. 17, have a practical application to the given case. Jesus means to say, not: I am this or that for my Father; I sustain to Him such or such a relation; but: "Whatever work you see me do, though it should give offence to you, like that for which I am now accused, be well assured that, as a submissive Son, I have done it only because I saw my Father acting in this way at the same time." There is no theology here; it is the explanation of His work which had been charged as criminal and of all His working in general, starting from the deepest law of His moral life, from His filial dependence with relation to His Father. This answer resembles the "I cannot do otherwise" of Luther, at Worms. Jesus puts His work under

[1] ℵ begins the verse thus: ελεγεν ουν αυτοις ο Ιησους. B L: ελεγεν instead of ειπεν.

[2] ℵ alone omits one of the two αμην.

the guarantee of His Father's, as the impotent man had just put his own under the guarantee of the work of Jesus (ver. 11).

The first proposition of ver. 19 presents this defense in a negative form: Nothing by myself; the second, in an affirmative form: Everything under the impulse of the Father. The expression: *can do nothing*, does not denote a metaphysical impossibility or one of essence, but a moral, that is absolutely free, powerlessness. This appears from ver. 26 and from the very term *Son*, which Jesus intentionally substitutes for the pronoun *I* of ver. 17. For it is in virtue of His filial—that is to say, His perfectly submissive and devoted—character, that Jesus is inwardly prevented from acting *of Himself*, at any moment whatever. He would indeed have the power of acting otherwise, if He wished; and here is the idea which gives to the expression ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ, *of Himself*, a real and serious meaning. In all the phases of His existence, the Son has a treasure of force belonging to Himself which He might use freely and independently of the Father. According to ver. 26, He could, as Logos, bring forth worlds out of nothing and make Himself their God. But *He is wholly with God*, here on earth as in heaven, (John i. 1); and rather than be the God of a world for Himself, He prefers to remain in His position as Son and not to use His creative power except in communion with His Father. This law of the Son in His divine life is also His law in His human existence. He possesses as man all the faculties of man, and besides, after the baptism, all the Messianic forces. Therewith He could create, of His own impulse, in the sense in which every man of talent creates—create by and for Himself, and could found here below a kingdom which should be His own, like men of genius and conquerors. Was it not to this very real power that the various suggestions of Satan appealed in the wilderness? But He voluntarily refused to make any such use of His human and Messianic powers, and, invariably connecting His work with that of His Father, He thus freely remains faithful to His character as Son. The clause ἐὰν μή τι . . . *unless He sees . . . doing it*, or rather: if He does not see the Father *doing it*, does not restrict the idea to: *do of Himself*. It is rather an epexegetical explanation of ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ, *of Himself:* "Of Himself, *that is to say*, if He does not see . . ." The present participle ποιοῦντα, *doing*, answers to ἀρτι, *now*, of ver. 17: The Son sees the Father *acting*, and associates Himself, *at the same instant*, with His action. The figurative term βλέπειν, *see*, denotes the look of the mind constantly fixed upon the Father to watch for His will and to discern the point where His working actually is, in order to adapt His own to it. In fact, this *cannot*, of which Jesus has just spoken, is only the negative side of His filial devotion. But love, while preventing His acting *by Himself*, causes Him to co-operate actively in the work of the Father. Contemplating it as already accomplished in the thought of God, He immediately executes it on the earth. He can only act on this condition.

This is the idea contained in the second part of ver. 19. It is united by *for* to the preceding. In fact, if every work of His own is impossible for the Son, it is because He devotes Himself *entirely* to the work of the

Father. The sum of His activity being absorbed in this voluntary dependence, there remains for Him neither time nor force for acting by Himself. Ἃ γὰρ ἂν, *the things, whatever they may be.* This word includes eventualities without number, and, as a consequence, many other infractions of their Pharisaic statutes besides the one which they have just seen and which gives them so much offense. But He has no change to make for this reason; for every work of the Father, whatever it may be, must reproduce itself in His work. The word *in like manner*, ὁμοίως, does not denote a mere *imitation*, for the Father's work is still to be done, since the Son sets Himself to the execution of it; it is rather, as *Reuss* says, "an application of the Son's work to the Father's." The Father's work becomes that of the Son, in so far as the latter is capable of containing the former. The Son connects Himself at each moment with the work of the Father, in order to continue it in the measure in which His intelligence can embrace it and His power realize it. In this saying, we know not which is the more astonishing, the simplicity of the form or the sublimity of the idea. Jesus speaks of this intimate relation with the Being of beings, as if the question were of the simplest thing in the world. It is the saying of the child of twelve years: "*Must I not be in that which belongs to my Father?*" raised to its highest power. But this perfect subordination of the Son's work to the Father's cannot exist except on one condition: that the Father consents to initiate the Son incessantly into the course of His working. This is also what He deigns to do.

Ver. 20. The relation of the Father to the Son: *For the Father loveth the Son, and showeth him all things that he himself doeth, and he will show him greater works than these, that ye may marvel.*" The co-operation of the Son in the divine work rests (*for*) upon the infinite love of the Father, which conceals nothing from the Son. The term φιλεῖν expresses tenderness (*to cherish*), and suits perfectly the intimacy of the relation here described. It was otherwise in iii. 35, where the word ἀγαπᾶν, which indicates the love of approbation and, in some sort, of admiration (ἄγαμαι), was found; because the question there was of the communication of omnipotence. The *showing* of the Father corresponds to the *seeing* of the Son (ver. 19), and is, at once, its condition and consequence; the condition: for the Father unveils His work to the Son, to the end that He may be able to know it and co-operate in it; the consequence: for it is this constant and faithful co-operation of the Son which causes this revelation incessantly to renew itself.

But the initiation and co-operation of the Son in the Father's work are subjected to a law of *progress*, as is suitable to the truly human state of this latter. This is what the end of the verse expresses: *And he will show him greater works than these.* The expression: *whatsoever things*, in ver. 19, gave a hint already of that gradual extension of the domain of the works which the Father entrusts to the Son. *Reuss* thinks that the question is of two different kinds of works, those of the Father appertaining to the outward domain, and those of the Son to the spiritual domain, and that the term *greater* refers to the superiority of the second to the first. But the

bodily resurrection is also the work of the Son (vv. 28, 29), and Jesus could not, in any case, say that the Son's works are greater than the Father's. The word ὁμοίως, *in like manner*, would suffice to refute this explanation. Τούτων, *than these*, evidently refers to the healing of the impotent man and to the miracles of the same sort which Jesus had performed and of which the Jews were then witnesses. This is only the beginning. In proportion as the work of Jesus grows in extent and force, the Father's work will pass more completely into it; and thus will the saying of Isaiah be realized: "*The pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in His hand.*" The word *will show* declares that the Father will give Him at once the signal and the power to accomplish these greater and still greater works. Comp. Apoc. i. 1: "the revelation which the Father gave to Him."

The words which close the verse: *to the end that ye may marvel*, are carefully weighed. Jesus refrains from saying: to the end that ye may believe. He knows too well to whom He is speaking at this moment. The question here, as *Weiss* says, is of a surprise of confusion. We might paraphrase thus: "And then there will truly be something at which you may be astonished." The Jews opened their eyes widely as they saw an impotent man healed: How will it be when they shall one day, at the word of this same Jesus, see mankind recovering spiritual, and even corporeal life! One cure astonishes them: What will they say of a Pentecost and a resurrection of the dead! This somewhat disdainful manner of speaking of miracles would be strange enough on the part of an evangelist who was in the whole course of his narrative playing the part of an inventor of miracles.—Ἵνα, *in order that*, expresses not only a result (ὥστε), but a purpose. This astonishment is willed by God; for it is from it that the conversion of Israel will issue at the end of time. In view of the wonders produced by the Gospel among mankind, Israel will finally render to the Son that homage, equal to what it renders to the Father, of which ver. 23 speaks.

These two verses are one of the most remarkable passages of the New Testament in the Christological point of view. *De Wette* finds in the expression, *of Himself* (ver. 19), an exclusive and scarcely clear reference to the *human* side of the person of Jesus; for, after all, if Jesus is the Logos, His will is as divine as that of the Father, and there can be no contrast between the one and the other, as the expression, *of Himself*, would imply. This defect in logic is found, according to his view, again in the words of xvi. 13, where this same expression, *of Himself*, is hypothetically applied to the Holy Spirit. According to *Lücke*, it is only a popular way of presenting the human appearance of Jesus, excluding the divine element. *Reuss* (t. II., pp. 438 ff.) brings out in this passage heresy upon heresy, if the Logos theory, as it has been presented in the Prologue, is taken as the norm of the Johannean thought. According to him, indeed, God is conceived, in the Prologue, as a purely abstract being, who does not act in space and time except through the intermediation of the Logos, who is perfectly equal to the Father, "the essence of God reproduced, so to speak, a second time and by itself." According to our passage, on the contrary, the Father does a work for Himself

(ἃ αὐτὸς ποιεῖ), which He reveals to the Son, and in which He gives Him a share, which is entirely contradictory. According to this latter view indeed, the Father acts directly in the world without making use of the Logos, and the Son is relatively to the Father in a condition of subordination, which is incompatible with "the equality of the two divine persons" taught in the Prologue.

The judgment of Lücke and de Wette undoubtedly strikes against the conception of the person of Jesus which is called orthodox, but not that of the New Testament and of John in particular. John does not know this Jesus, *now* divine, *now* human, to which the traditional exegesis has recourse. He knows a Logos who, once deprived of the divine state, entered fully into the human state, and, after having been revealed to Himself at the baptism as a divine subject, continued His human development, and only through the ascension recovered the divine state. By His human existence and His earthly activity, He realized in the form of *becoming*, the same filial relation which He realized in His divine existence in the form of *being*. This is the reason why all the terms employed by Jesus—the *showing* of the Father, the *seeing* of the Son, the expressions "*cannot*" and "*of Himself*"—apply to the different phases of His divine and human existence, to each one according to its nature and its measure. To understand the "*of Himself*," in our passage and xvi. 13, it is only necessary to take in earnest, as the Scripture does, the distinction of persons in the divine being; if each one of them has His own life, from which He may draw at will, there is no inconsequence between the passages cited.

As to the judgment of Reuss, the idea, which he finds in the Prologue, of an abstract divinity, purely transcendental and without any possible relation to the world, is not that of John; it is only that of Philo. On the contrary, God is, in the Prologue, a Father full of love both for His Son (ver. 18) and for the children whom He Himself begets by communicating to them His own life (ἐκ θεοῦ ἐγεννήθησαν, *were begotten of God*, ver. 13). He can thus act directly in the world and, consequently, associate His Son, made man, in His work on the earth. Vv. 19, 20 are in contradiction to the theory of Philo, but not to the conception of the evangelist. It is exactly the same with regard to the subordination of the Son. The true thought of the Prologue is exactly that of our two verses, 19, 20; the dependence, and free dependence, of the Son (ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν, ver. 1). This conception of the Logos undoubtedly, also, contradicts that of Philo, a fact which only proves one thing: that it is an error to make the evangelist the disciple of that strange philosopher, while he is simply the disciple of Jesus Christ. (Introd., pp. 127 ff.)

If we wish to form a lively idea of the relation of the work of Jesus to that of the Father, as it is presented here, the best way is to enter ourselves into a similar relation to the Lord Jesus Christ. We shall then have this experience: that the more the faithful servant heartily participates in the work of his Master, the more also does the latter give him understanding in respect to the totality and the details, and the more does He make him capable of realizing it. The agent grows with the work, as the work grows with the agent. The following are well-known examples of each of the two things: Oberlin, his eyes fixed upon Christ as Christ had His eyes fixed upon the Father, discerning the point which the divine work has reached among the inhabitants of Ban-de-la-Roche and what the continuation of this work demands; John Bost, contemplating so many sufferings unrelieved on the soil of France; Felix Neff, shocked at the sight of the

deserted Churches of the High Alps; Wilberforce, feeling the chains of his enslaved brethren weigh upon his heart; Antoine Court, weeping over the ruins of the Reformed Church of France; Zinzendorf, finding himself suddenly in the presence of the persecuted Moravian emigrants who arrive in troops in his own lands . . . ; in all these cases, the faithful workman applies his ear to the heart of his Master, discerns its beating, and then, rising up, acts. Christ's work, that work which He wishes to do, passes then, in a certain portion of it, into the hands of His servant. Thus it is, no doubt, that Christ gradually entered into possession of the divine work, even till it became His own in its totality (John iii. 35). And having come to this point He gradually gives His own a part in it, who become the free sharers in His working, and He makes real to them that promise which is not without analogy to the saying which we are explaining: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, that he who believeth in me, he also shall do the works which I do; he shall do even *greater works than these* (*μείζονα τούτων*), because I go to my Father" (xiv. 12).

Jesus has just spoken of works, greater than His present miracles, which He will one day accomplish at the signal of His Father. He now explains what these works are; they are *the resurrection* and *the judgment* of mankind, vv. 21–29. This difficult passage has been very differently understood. I. Several Fathers, *Tertullian*, *Chrysostom*, later *Erasmus*, *Grotius*, *Bengel*, finally in recent times *Schott*, *Kuinoel*, *Hengstenberg*, etc., have applied the whole of the passage (except ver. 24) to the resurrection of the dead, *in the strict sense*, and to the last judgment. II. A diametrically opposite interpretation was held already by the Gnostics, then, among the moderns, by *Ammon*, *Schweizer*, *B. Crusius*,—it is that which refers the whole passage, even vv. 28, 29, to the *spiritual* resurrection and the moral judgment which the Gospel effects; (see also *Reuss*, in some sort). III. Finally, a third group of interpreters unite these two views in this sense, that they refer vv. 21–27 to the *moral* action of the Gospel, and vv. 28, 29 to the resurrection of the dead in the proper sense. These are, *Calvin*, *Lampe*, and most of the moderns, *Lücke*, *Tholuck*, *Meyer*, *de Wette*, etc. IV. By taking account, with greatest care, of the shades of expression, we arrive at the opinion that the true progress of ideas is the following: In a first cycle, the thought of ver. 17 has been quite summarily developed (vv. 19, 20). Then, the works of the Father which the Son is to accomplish are precisely stated in a second cycle (vv. 21–23); those of *making alive* and *judging*. Finally, in a third cycle (vv. 24–29) the thought makes a final advance, which brings it to its end, in the sense that vv. 24–27 apply to the resurrection and the spiritual judgment, and vv. 27–29 to the final judgment and the resurrection of the dead. This last view is, as it seems to me, nearly that of several modern commentators, such as *Luthardt*, *Weiss* and *Keil*.

Ver. 21. "*For, as the Father raiseth the dead and giveth them life, so doth the Son also make alive whom He will.*" To raise the dead is a greater work than to heal an impotent man; hence the *for*. This work, as well as the particular miracles, is the reproduction of the Father's work. The great

difficulty here is to determine whether, as the greater part of the interpreters seem to think (for many do not explain themselves sufficiently on this point), the work of resurrection ascribed to the Father is to be identified with that which the Son accomplishes, or whether it is specifically different, or, finally, whether they combine with one another by a process, the formula of which must be sought after.[1] According to the first explanation, the ζωοποιεῖν, *give life*, ascribed to the Father, would remain in a purely ideal state until the Son, yielding to the divine initiative, caused the design of the Father to pass into the earthly reality. Thus *Luthardt* says: "The work belongs to God, in so far as it proceeds from Him; to the Son, in so far as it is accomplished by Him in the world" (p. 444). *Gess:* "It is not that the resurrection of the dead was until now the work of the Father, to become now the work of the Son; the resurrection of the dead is not yet an accomplished fact. No more is it that one part of the dead are raised by the Father, another by the Son. . . . But the Son is regarded as *the organ* by which the Father raises from the dead." *Bäumlein:* "The Son is the bearer and mediator of the Father's activity." This sense is very good in itself; but does it really suit the expression: *like as?* Was this indeed the proper term to designate a single divine impulse, an initiative of a purely moral nature? Jesus, in expressing Himself thus, seems to be thinking, rather, of a *real* work which the Father accomplishes and to which His own corresponds. According to the second sense, adopted by *Reuss*, we must ascribe the *bodily* resurrection to the Father and the resurrection in the spiritual sense, *salvation*, to the Son. Reuss finds the proof of this distinction in the οὓς θέλει, *whom he wills*, which indicates a selection and refers consequently to the moral domain only. This solution is untenable. How could vv. 28, 29, which describe the consummation of the Son's work, be applied to the spiritual resurrection? Comp. likewise vi. 40, 44, etc., where Jesus expressly ascribes to Himself, by an ἐγώ, *I*, several times repeated, the resurrection of the body—a fact which entirely destroys the line of demarcation proposed by Reuss. Jesus seems to me rather to speak here of the divine action, at once creative, preservative and restorative, which is exercised from the beginning of things in the sphere of nature, and which has broken forth with a new power in the theocratic domain. Comp. Deut. xxxii. 39: "I kill and *make alive*, I wound and *heal*." 1 Sam. ii. 6: "It is the Lord who killeth and *maketh alive*, who bringeth down to the grave and *bringeth up* from it." To this work of moral and physical restoration, till now accomplished by God, Jesus now unites His own; He becomes the agent of it in the particular sphere in which He finds Himself at each moment; this sphere will extend itself ever more widely; His capacity, in Himself, for performing it will increase in the same measure,

[1] As if (to take up anew the comparison of the common work of Jesus and Joseph) we had to decide for one of these three forms: Either Jesus executing the plans traced out by Joseph; or each of the two having a distinct part in the work; or, finally, Jesus seconding Joseph more and more, in proportion as He grows, and ending by charging Himself with the whole of the work.

until this domain is the universe and the power of the Son is omnipotence (comp. Matt. xxviii. 18). The steps of this growth are the following: He begins to perform isolated miracles of corporeal and spiritual resurrection, samples of His great future work. From the time of His elevation to glory, He realizes, through the communication of the Holy Spirit, the moral resurrection of mankind. Finally, on His return, by the victory which He gains over the last enemy, death (1 Cor. xv. 26), He effects, in the physical domain, the resurrection of believers, and afterwards also the universal resurrection. At that moment only will the work of the Father have passed entirely into His hands. The work of the Son is not, therefore, different from that which the Father acccomplishes. Only the Son, made man, becomes the agent of it only by degrees. The present, *makes alive*, in the second member, is a present of competency. Comp. indeed vv. 25 and 28 ("the hour *cometh* that . . . "), which show that the reality is yet to come. Nevertheless, even now, the word of Christ possesses a life-giving force (*the hour even now is*, ver. 25). We may connect the object *the dead* with the first verb only (*raiseth*), and give to the second verb (ζωοποιεῖ, *gives life*), an absolute sense. But perhaps it is more natural to make the words, *the dead*, the object of both of the verbs (see *Weiss*). Ἐγείρειν, strictly *to awake*, refers to the passage from death to life; ζωοποιεῖν, *to give life*, to the full restoration of life, whether spiritual or bodily. Nothing forces us, with *Reuss*, to restrict the application of the word *make alive*, in the second member, to spiritual life The restriction: *to whom he wills*, undoubtedly indicates a selection. But will there not be a selection, also, in the bodily resurrection? In ver. 29, Jesus distinguishes, in fact, two bodily resurrections, one of *life*, the other of *judgment*. The first alone truly merits the name of making alive.

By saying: *those whom he wills*, Jesus does not contrast His will as Son with that of the Father. This meaning would require οὓς αὐτὸς θέλει. He contrasts those whom He feels Himself constrained to make alive (believers) with those on behalf of whom it is morally impossible for Him to accomplish this miracle. These words, therefore, are the transition to ver. 22, where it is said that *the judgment*, that is to say, the selection, is committed to Him. In effecting the selection which decides the eternal death and life of individuals, Jesus does not cease for an instant to have His eyes fixed upon the Father, and to conform Himself to His purpose. According to vi. 38, 40, He discerns those who fulfill the divinely appointed condition: *he that believeth;* and immediately He applies to them the life-giving power which the Father has given to Him, and which has now become His own. Might there not be in this οὓς θέλει, *those whom he wills*, an allusion to the spontaneity with which Jesus had offered healing to the impotent man, without being in any way solicited by him, choosing him freely among all the sick persons who surrounded the pool? *Reuss* finds, in these words: *those whom he wills*, a contradiction to the idea of the dependence of the Son's work as related to that of the Father. But the inward feeling which makes Jesus *will* in such or such a way, while forming itself in Him spontaneously, is none the less in accord with that of God. Jesus

wills of *His own* will, as He loves of *His own* love. But this love and this will have the same objects and the same end as the love and will of the Father. Comp. the formula, in the Apostolic Epistles: "Grace and peace *from* God, and the Lord Jesus Christ." Liberty is no more arbitrariness in Jesus, than in God. In the same sense it is ascribed to the Spirit (iii. 8 and 1 Cor. xii. 11), and to the God of nature (1 Cor. xv. 38). What Jesus meant to express here is not, therefore, as *Calvin* and formerly *Reuss* have supposed, the idea of predestination, it is the glorious competency which it pleases God to bestow upon Jesus for the accomplishment of the common work. He is a source of life like the Father, morally at first, and then, one day, corporeally. While affirming His voluntary dependence, Jesus allows a glimpse to be gained of the magnificence of His filial prerogative.

Vv. 22, 23. "*For also the Father judgeth no man; but he hath committed all power of judging unto the Son, 23, to the end that all may honor the Son as they honor the Father. He that honoreth not the Son honoreth not the Father who sent him.*" Two particles connect ver. 22 with the preceding: γάρ, *for*, and οὐδέ (translated by *also*), which literally signifies: *and no more*. The meaning is, therefore: "For the Father *no more* judges any one (no more than He raises from the dead, when once He has committed to the Son the charge and power of raising from the dead," ver. 21). The *for* presents the second fact (the passing over of judgment to the Son) as the explanation of the first (the passing over of the power to raise from the dead). Indeed, to make alive is to absolve; to refuse to make alive is to condemn. The power of making alive those whom one wills implies, therefore, the dignity of a *judge*. *Meyer* understands *judge* here, as in chap. iii., in the sense of *condemn*. But in ver. 21, the question is expressly of making alive, saving, and not of the opposite; and the expression τὴν κρίσιν πᾶσαν, *judgment in all its forms* (ver. 22), shows that the term *judge* should be taken in the most general sense. *H. Meyer* (*Discourses of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 36) is shocked because this term is taken in ver. 22 in the *spiritual* sense (present moral judgment), in ver. 29 in the *external* sense (the final judgment), and finally in ver. 30 in a sense purely *subjective* (the individual judgment of Jesus), and hence he concludes that the tenor of the discourse has not been, in this case, exactly reproduced. But in ver. 22 the question is of judgment in the most *general* sense, without definite application (*all judgment*). It is only in the following cycle, vv. 24–29, that the meaning of this term is precisely stated, and that it is taken, first, in the spiritual sense, then, in the external sense. Everything is, therefore, correct in the progress of the thought.

Ver. 23. And what is the Father's will in transferring to Jesus the two highest attributes of divinity, *making alive, judging?* He wills that the homage of adoration which humanity renders to Him should be extended to the Son Himself. "The Father loveth the Son" (iii. 35); this is the reason why He wishes to see the world at the feet of the Son, even as at His own. "The equality of honor," says *Weiss*, "must correspond with the equality of action." The word τιμᾶν, *to honor*, does not directly ex-

press the act of adoration, as *Reuss* remarks. But in the context (καθώς ας), it certainly denotes the religious respect of which the act of adoration is the expression. And in claiming for His person this sentiment, in the same sense in which it is due to the Father, Jesus authorizes, as related to Himself, worship properly so called, comp. xx. 28; Phil. ii. 10 "that every knee *should bow* at the name of Jesus;" and the Apocalypse throughout. The Father is not jealous of such homage. For it is He whom the creature honors in honoring the Son because of His divine character; as also it is to God that honor is refused, when it is refused to the Son. There is a terrible warning for the accusers of Jesus in these last words of the verse. Jesus throws back upon them the charge of blasphemy; they must learn—these zealous defenders of the glory of God—that when they accuse Him, Jesus, as they are doing, because of the miracle which He has performed in the midst of them, it is God to whom the outrage which they inflict upon Him is addressed, and that the treatment to which they subject this weak and poor man touches the Father Himself, who places Himself in closest union with Him. This menacing close of ver. 23 is an anticipation of the severe application which is to terminate the discourse (vv. 41–47).

The second cycle vv. 21–23 was a still very general development of the abridged cycle vv. 19, 20. In the third cycle, vv. 24–29, Jesus now shows the progressive *historical* realization of these two works of *making alive* and *judging*, which the Father has conferred upon Him. Until this point (vv. 21–23) He has attributed them to Himself only under the abstract form of mere competency. Now we behold this twofold power of saving and judging really in exercise, first in the spiritual sphere, vv. 24–27; then, in the *outward* domain, vv. 28, 29.

Vv. 24–27. First phase: the *spiritual* resurrection and *moral* judgment of humanity by the Son.

Ver. 24. "*Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth him that sent me, hath eternal life; and he cometh not into judgment, but is passed from death into life.*" Divine things are present to the mind of Jesus; He speaks that which He sees (iii. 11); hence this energetic affirmation: "*Verily, verily, I say unto you*" (vv. 24, 25). These words set forth, at the same time, the greatness of the fact announced. It is really unheard of: For him who receives with confidence His word, the two decisive acts of the eschatological drama, the resurrection and the judgment, are completed things. The simple word of Jesus received with faith has accomplished everything. This fact is indeed the proof of the qualities of life-giver and judge which Jesus ascribed to Himself (vv. 21, 22). Ἀκούειν, *to hear*, denotes not, as *Weiss* thinks, the outward hearing only, in contrast to the inward reception, which would come afterwards (*and believeth . . .*); it is the spiritual hearing, at the same time with the physical, in the sense of Matt. xiii. 43. For the verb *believe* has a new object (*Keil*); it is *the Father* as the one who has sent the Son. To surrender oneself to the word of Jesus in faith in the divine character of His being and word, is to render homage not only to the Son, but also to the

Father. The meaning of *ἐχει ζωήν, has life*, can be fully rendered here only by saying "has life *already*." It is the proof of ver. 21: "The Son makes alive." Is it not, indeed, His word which works this miracle? Καί, *and*, signifies: *and in consequence*. The exemption from judgment follows naturally from the entrance into life. The place of judgment is at the threshold of life and death. Ἐρχεται, *comes*, is the present of idea. The word *judgment* is by no means equivalent to *condemnation*, κατάκρισις, as *Meyer* will have it and as *Ostervald* translates. A judgment deciding on eternal destiny, says *Weiss*, is no longer possible with regard to the man who has in fact already obtained salvation. By the word of Jesus, received into the inner man, the believer undergoes this moral judgment here on earth to which unbelievers will be subjected at the last day. The revelation of the hidden things (1 Cor. iv. 5) is made in the inner forum of his conscience, where everything is condemned in succession which will be condemned for the rest before the tribunal at the last judgment. The judgment, is thus for him, an accomplished thing. If therefore the word received with faith frees the believer from the judgment, it is because it anticipates it; comp. xii. 48, where it is said that the judge, at the last day, will be no other than this same word. What a feeling of the absolute holiness and of the perfection of His word do not such expressions imply in the consciousness of Jesus! The reconciliation of this passage with Rom. xiv. 10 and 2 Cor. v. 10 has been given at iii. 18. The last words: *But he hath passed from death unto life*, contrast (*but*) the condition of him who has entered into life with the fate of the one who will have to pass through the judgment. The terms *death* and *life* are taken in the spiritual sense. *Westcott* thinks that, in this verse, the idea of the physical resurrection is still united with that of the spiritual resurrection. The combination of these two ideas seems to me impossible. The question is of the effects of the *word* of Jesus in the sense of His word of teaching. It is altogether arbitrary to explain the μεταβέβηκεν, with *Bäumlein*, in the sense of "*has the pledge of being able* to pass from death to life."

Ver. 25. "*Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour is coming, and now is,*[1] *when the dead shall hear*[2] *the voice of the Son of God,*[3] *and they that*[4] *hear shall live.*"[5] A new affirmation, which Christ draws from the depths of His consciousness. An immense perspective opens before Him. The great act of the spiritual resurrection of humanity dead in its sins, dead to God, is to begin at this hour, and it is through Him that it will be wholly accomplished! The identity of the formula which begins these two verses, 24 and 25, "*verily, verily, I say unto you*" as well as the *asyndeton*, which makes the second the energetic reaffirmation of the first, would suffice to prove that ver. 25 cannot refer to a fact essentially differ-

[1] ℵ a b omit the words και νυν εστιν.

[2] Instead of ακουσονται, ℵ L some Mnn. read ακουσωσιν, and B some Mnn. ακουσουσιν.

[3] Instead of θεου, K S and some other authorities read ανθρωπου (*of man*).

[4] ℵ rejects οι (*and having heard, they . . .*).

[5] T. R. with 11 Mjj. and nearly all the Mnn. ζησονται; ℵ B D L: ζησουσιν.

ent from the preceding, and how wrong it is for *Keil* to find included here at once the physical and the spiritual resurrection. Jesus has passed, at ver. 24, from the general idea of resurrection to that of the spiritual resurrection in particular; He does not return backward. Only in order to make a picture, He borrows from the physical resurrection the images by which He wished to depict the spiritual work which is to prepare the way for it. He seems to allude to the magnificent vision of Ezekiel, in which the prophet, standing in the midst of a plain covered with dry bones, calls them to life, first, by his word, and then, by the breath of Jehovah. Thus Jesus abides here below the only living one in the midst of humanity plunged in the death of sin, and the hour is approaching in which He is going to accomplish with reference to it a work like that which God entrusted to the prophet with regard to Israel in captivity. There is here a feeling analogous to that which leads Him to say in the Synoptics: "*Let the dead bury their dead.*" The expression: *The hour cometh, and is now come*, is intended (comp. iv. 23) to open the eyes of all to the grandeur of this epoch which is passing and of that which is in preparation. Jesus says: *the hour cometh;* what He means is the sending of the Holy Spirit (vii. 37–39). But he adds: *and is now come;* for His word, which is spirit and life (vi. 63), is already preparing the hearts to receive the Spirit. Comp. xiv. 17. For the expression: *my word*, Jesus substitutes: *the voice of the Son of God.* The teaching of Christ is thus presented as the personal voice of Him who calls sinners to life. The article *οἱ* before *ἀκούσαντες* (*those who* have heard), distinctly separates the spiritually dead into two classes: those who hear the voice without understanding it (comp. xii. 40), and those who, when hearing it, *have ears to hear*, hear it inwardly. Only these last are made alive by it. It is the function of *judging* which is accomplished under this form.

Those who apply this verse to the resurrection of the dead in the strict sense, are obliged to refer the words: *and now is*, to a few miraculous resurrections wrought by Jesus in the course of His ministry, and to explain the words *οἱ ἀκούσαντες* in this sense: *and after having heard . . .* But all *Hengstenberg's* efforts have not succeeded in justifying this grammatically impossible interpretation of *οἱ ἀκούσαντεις*. According to *Olshausen*, ver. 24 refers to the spiritual resurrection, and ver. 25 to the *first* bodily resurrection—that of believers at the Parousia (1 Cor. xv. 23). Vv. 28, 29, finally, designate the final, universal resurrection. The words: *and now is*, must, in that case, refer to the resurrection of the few believers who appeared after the resurrection of Christ (Matt. xxvii. 52, 53). Undoubtedly, Jesus admits a distinction between the first resurrection and the universal resurrection (Luke xiv. 14: *to the resurrection of the just;* comp. Apoc. xx. 6); but the explanation which Olshausen gives of the words: *and now is*, is not open to discussion. Nothing in the text authorizes us to see here the indication of a resurrection different from that of ver. 24. The following verse explains the secret of the power which the voice of Christ will display in the hour which is about to strike for the earth.

Ver. 26. "*For, as*[1] *the Father hath life in himself, so hath he also given to the Son to have life in himself.*" The emphasis is on the twice-repeated words ἐν ἑαυτῷ (*in himself*), which terminate the two clauses. The Son not only has a *part* in life, like the creature: He possesses it in Himself, and He is thereby the source of it, like the Father Himself—hence His voice can give or restore life (ver. 25; comp. i. 3, 4). But, on the other hand, this divine prerogative the Son does not possess except as a gift of the Father. Here is the boldest paradox which it is possible to declare. Life in Himself, what in theology is called *aseity*, self-existence, *given* to the Son! We could not get an insight into the solution of this contradiction, unless we saw an analogous contradiction resolved in ourselves. We possess, as *a thing given*, the faculty of determining for ourselves, that is, of ourselves morally creating ourselves. We draw at each instant from this faculty moral decisions which appertain peculiarly to ourselves, for which we are seriously responsible before God, and which are transmuted into our permanent character. It is through making us a gift of this mysterious privilege of free action, that God has placed us in the rank of beings made in His *image*. What freedom is for man, this the divine faculty of living in Himself is for the Son. It is by this means, also, that the *subordination* of the Son to the Father becomes an act of divine freedom, and consequently, of divine love. By the gift of divine independence to the Son, the Father has given Him everything; by His perfect and voluntary subordination, the Son gives back everything to the Father. To give everything, to give back everything, is not this perfect love. *God is love.* Thus, not only does God love divinely, but He is also divinely loved. The act expressed by the word, ἔδωκεν (*gave*), is regarded by *Tholuck*, *Luthardt*, *Weiss*, etc., as a fact falling within the earthly life of Jesus: Jesus possesses, here on earth, spiritual life abiding in Him, and can communicate it to men. But if this were the full meaning of this word, how would it harmonize with vi. 57, where Jesus declares that in His earthly condition "*He lives only by the Father*," just as we, believers, live only by Him. It must, therefore, be acknowledged, that He is speaking of an eternal gift, of a unique prerogative appertaining to His divine state and entering into His essential Sonship. The spiritual resurrection of mankind through Him, this is the work which He wishes to explain in this passage; this work is yet to come; it implies the re-instatement of Christ in His divine state (xvii. 1, 2, 5). This expression must, consequently, be applied to Him in so far as raised, as man, to the supreme position which He enjoyed, as Logos, before the incarnation. It is from the midst of this glory that He will accomplish the resurrection described in vv. 24, 25 (*the hour cometh*); for it is then only that He can pour out the Spirit (vii. 39; xvii. 2). With the spiritual resurrection and judgment is closely connected, as a second divine act, the judgment together with the external resurrection, which is the condition of it.

Ver. 27. "*And he hath given him power also*[2] *to execute judgment, because*

[1] ℵ D: ως, instead of ωσπερ. [2] A B L Itplerlq Syrcur Cop. Orig. (twice) omit the second και.

he is son of man." Jesus had said in ver. 22, in an indefinite way, that *all* judgment is committed to Him. This word *all judgment* included, of course, both the present moral, internal judgment and the final, external judgment. It is under these two aspects, taken together, that this idea is reproduced in ver. 27, which thus forms the transition from the work of the spiritual resurrection and judgment (vv. 24–26), to that of the outward resurrection and judgment (vv. 28, 29). Jesus adds to the idea of ver. 22 a new limitation: that the function of judge is committed to Him inasmuch as He is *Son of man*. The second καί *also*, although omitted by B, is perhaps authentic. It emphasizes the relation between the character of judge and that of Son of man. What is this relation? It has been understood in a great variety of ways. According to *Lücke* the meaning is: Because He is the *Messiah* and judging is (according to Dan. vii.) a Messianic function. But in that case the article before the words *Son of man* could not be wanting. Without the article, this expression signifies simply: *a son of man*. *Keil* denies this and thinks that the absence of the article may be explained by the fact that the words are here the predicate, designating a quality, rather than a person. He explains therefore: Because He is mediator between God and man, author of salvation and consequently judge; for judgment forms a part of the salvation. But the absence of the article is not justified by this, and the idea of salvation is arbitrarily introduced here. *Beyschlag* understands: Because He is the perfect man, the ideal man, fitted to serve as the standard for the moral worth of all others. But the article could not, any more than in the other case, be wanting with this meaning. The term, Son of man, without the article sets forth simply the quality of *man* which He shares with all other men. *Lange:* Because, as a son of man, He can have compassion on our weakness. But this would be to deny to God the feeling of compassion, while the Scriptures say expressly: "Like as a Father pitieth . . . ., so the Lord pitieth . . . . for *he knoweth our frame*" (Ps. cii. 13). Heb. ii. 18 cannot be cited as parallel, since the question there is of intercession, not of judgment. *De Wette:* Because the Father, as being the hidden God, cannot judge. *Reuss*, nearly the same: "In the system, God, in Himself, does not place Himself in contact with the world which He is to judge; He makes Himself man for this."[1] This reason would apply to the God of Philo, not to the God of Jesus Christ and of St. John; the latter is a Father, who is in direct relations with the world and humanity; He begets children for life (i. 13); He *loves* the world (iii. 16); He even *testifies* by outward miracles in favor of the Son; He *draws* souls to Christ, etc. Such a God might also, if He wished, judge the world. Besides, as *Luthardt* observes, the opposite of the hidden God would not be the Son *of man*, but the revealed God, the Word, the Son *of God*, or, speaking absolutely, the Son. *Meyer* and *Weiss:* Because Jesus is, as man, the

[1] Reuss, in his last work (*Théol. johann.*), quotes without remark this very different explanation: "God was obliged to *delegate* judgment to Him, because He in His quality as man could not Himself exercise it." But the special relation between the *has given* and the *because*, would, in that case, need to have been more distinctly marked.

executor and proclaimer of salvation, on which depends the decision of each man's destiny. There is the same reason against this explanation, as against that of *Keil.* The quality of man is made prominent here for the purpose of explaining, not the dignity of *Saviour*, but that of judge. *Holtzmann:* Because He can make the revelation of the divine holiness shine forth before the eyes of men through the fact of His human appearance. But God is able directly to manifest His holiness to the human conscience, as is many times seen in the Old Testament. *Hengstenberg:* to recompense Him for becoming man. Strange reward! In this embarrassment, the *Peschito* (Syr^{sch}), some Mjj. (E. M Δ.), and *Chrysostom* have recourse to a desperate expedient; they connect these words: "because he is son . . ." with the following verse: "Because He is a Son of man, marvel not." But what is there in the context leading us to suppose an astonishment respecting this point? Is it then so difficult to grasp the thought of Jesus? The judgment of humanity is a homage rendered to the holiness of God; but this homage, in order really to make reparation for the outrage committed, must proceed from the race itself which has committed the offense. Judgment, in this view, is exactly on the same line with expiation, of which it serves as the complement. Expiation is the reparation freely offered by believing humanity; judgment is the satisfaction which God takes from humanity which has refused Him this reparation. In the one, as in the other, of these acts, a man must preside.

Vv. 28, 29. "*Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming when all who are in the tombs shall hear his voice and shall come forth,* 29, *those who have done good, unto a resurrection of life, those who have done evil, unto a resurrection of judgment.*" The Lord reaches here the more outward domain, both as to the resurrection (ver. 28), and as to the judgment (ver. 29). It is impossible, indeed, not to refer ver. 28 to the resurrection of the dead, in the proper sense. 1. The question is of a wholly future event; for Jesus purposely omits here the words: *καὶ νῦν ἐστί, and now is,* of ver. 25. 2. He does not merely say, *the dead* (as in ver. 25); He uses the expression: *those who are in the tombs,* an expression which must, of course, be taken in the strict sense. 3. No more does He say: *those who shall hear* (ver. 25), an expression which implies a selection between two classes, but: *All those who are in the graves shall hear;* that is to say, the whole number of the dead. 4. Finally, He does not speak, as previously, of a single result: life; but of two opposite results which that resurrection will have (ver. 29). Jesus rises, therefore, from the highest act *of authority* (*ἐξουσία*), the judgment, to the highest act of *power* (*δύναμις*), the resurrection of the body; and this is the way in which He reasons: "*Marvel not* because I attribute to myself the right of judging (ver. 27), for behold the display of divine power which it shall one day be given me to make: to bring all mankind out of the grave." *Lücke* gives quite another turn to the thought of Jesus: "You will cease to be astonished that judgment is given to me, if you call to mind that as Son of man (as Messiah), it is I who accomplish the resurrection." Jesus according to his view, makes

His starting point, as from a thing well known and acknowledged, from an article of Jewish theology, according to which the Messiah is the one who is to raise mankind from the dead. But it is still doubtful whether, at the time of Jesus, the work of the resurrection was ascribed to the Messiah. Even the later Jewish theology shows itself very much divided on this point. Some ascribe this act to the omnipotent God, others to the Messiah (Eisenmenger, *Entdeckt, Judenth.* Th. II. pp. 897–899). This mechanical appeal to a Jewish doctrine is, moreover, little in accord with the ever original character of the testimony of Jesus. Finally, the meaning given by Lücke implies a false interpretation of the term *son of man*, ver. 27. There is great force in the words: shall hear *His voice.* "This voice which sounds in your ears at this moment, will be the one that shall awake you from the sleep of death and cause you to come forth from the tomb. Marvel not, therefore, that I claim to possess both the authority to judge and the power to raise from the dead spiritually." Thus the last convulsion of the physical world, the universal resurrection, will be the work of that same human will which shall have renewed the moral world —that of the Son of Man. "*Since death came by man,*" says St. Paul with precisely the same meaning, "*the resurrection of the dead comes also by man*" (1 Cor. xv. 21). No doubt, it might be said to Jesus: All these are only assertions on thy part. But we must not forget that behind these affirmations there was a fact—namely, "*Arise and walk,*" immediately followed by a result, which was at once the text of this discourse and its point of support. The twenty-ninth verse concludes this whole development by the idea of the final judgment, of which the resurrection of the body is the condition. To be judged, the dead must be revived in the fullness of their consciousness and of their personality, which implies their restoration to bodily existence. We must not translate: "Those who shall have done good, evil works," but: "*the* good, *the* evil works." In these two expressions is declared, as *Keil* says, the *total* result of the life in good or evil. In the former of these expressions are included the moral sincerity which leads to faith (iii. 21), the act of faith itself, when the hour of calling for it has come, finally, all the fruits of sanctification which result from faith. The latter comprehends the natural inward depravity which alienates from faith, unbelief which voluntarily takes sides with sin against the light (iii. 19, 20), finally, all the inevitable, immoral consequences of such a choice. On the use of the word ποιεῖν with ἀγαθά and πράσσειν with φαῦλα, see on iii. 20. The expression *resurrection of life* is explained by the opposite term: *resurrection of judgment.* The latter can only signify: resurrection leading to judgment; the former, only; resurrection introducing to the fullness of life, and that without any further necessity of a judgment in order to decide this favorable result. *Luthardt* and *Weiss* take the genitive ζωῆς, *of life*, as a limiting word of cause or quality: a resurrection which results from life (spiritual) already possessed (vv. 24, 25), or which is appropriate to that life. But there are degrees in the development of life, and if this resurrection, on the one hand, presupposes life, it may also, on the other hand, have life as its result. Here

also we must avoid translating κρίσις, with *Osterwald, Arnaud*, etc., by *condemnation.*

Reuss maintains that the spiritual resurrection is in this passage declared to be "greater and more important than the physical resurrection" (see on ver. 20); and in his attempt to make this idea accord with the: "*Marvel not,*" of ver. 28, which implies the opposite, the following is the meaning which he gives to these words: "Marvel not that I speak to you, as I have just been doing, of a moral resurrection which must precede the physical resurrection. For you hold yourselves that the Messiah is to accomplish the latter; and this is in your eyes the more astonishing." But these words *in your eyes* are an importation of the commentator, intended to justify his system, according to which he has been able to write respecting the fourth Gospel that line, in manifest contradiction to the reality (vv. 28, 29): "The idea of a future and universal judgment is repudiated as something superfluous" (II., p. 559). *Scholten*, feeling the powerlessness of every exegetical expedient to reach the end which is pursued, that of causing every trace of the ordinary eschatology to disappear from our Gospel, declares vv. 28, 29 to be unauthentic, which verses, nevertheless, are not wanting in any document. He reasons thus: the activity of Jesus extending, according to pseudo-John, only to men *who are in this life* . . . , vv. 28, 29, must be interpolated." Convenient method! When they do not find the Gospel such as they *wish*, they make it such! *Hilgenfeld* (*Einl.*, p. 729), does not hesitate to affirm that our passage excludes all the Judæo-Christian eschatology, the outward coming of Jesus, a first resurrection, etc. But even though our passage does not contain all the elements of the picture, it does not absolutely exclude any one of them. Much more, the glorious coming of the Messiah is implied in ver. 28, and the entire eschatological drama, which the Parousia is to inaugurate, is summed up in ver. 29, so far as relates to the *final result*, which alone is of importance here, the resurrection and the judgment as works of Jesus.

After this passage (vv. 19–29), the development of the idea of ver. 17: "My Father worketh until now and I also work," is completely unfolded and Jesus returns to the starting-point.

Ver. 30. "*I can do nothing of myself; as I hear, I judge; and my judgment is just, because I seek not mine own will, but the will of him who sent me.*"[1] Can ver. 30 be connected with what immediately precedes, by the idea of judgment which is common to this verse and ver. 29? But the *present* tense: *I judge* (ver. 30) does not suit the idea of the future judgment (ver. 29); and the first clause: *I can do nothing of myself*, impresses at once on the thought of ver. 30 a much more general bearing. We are evidently brought back to the idea of ver. 19, which served as the starting-point of the preceding development: the infallibility of the Son's work finding its guarantee in its complete dependence on that of the Father. As *Reuss* well says: "The last verse reproduces the substance of the first; and the discourse thus is rounded out even externally." After having ascribed to Himself the most wonderful operations, Jesus seems to feel the need of

[1] T. R. adds πατρος at the end of the verse, with E G H M S U V Mnn., It^{aliq}; this word is rejected by ℵ A B D K L Δ Λ 12 Mnn. It^{brix} Vulg. Syr. Cop. Orig. (three times).

sinking again, as related to the Father, into a sort of nothingness. He who successively accomplishes the greatest works, is powerless to accomplish by Himself the humblest act. The pronoun ἐγώ (*I*), positively applies to that visible and definite personality which they have before their eyes the unheard of things which He has just affirmed, in a more abstract way, of *the Son*. This is the first difference between ver. 30 and ver. 19; the following is the second: In order to describe the total subordination of His work to that of the Father, Jesus made use of figures borrowed from the sense of sight: the Father *shows*, the Son *sees*. Here He borrows His figures from the sense of hearing: the Son *hears*, evidently from His Father's lips, the sentences which He is to pronounce, and it is only thus that He *judges*. Moreover, of the two divine works which He accomplishes, *raising from the dead* and *judging*, it was especially the first which Jesus had in view in ver. 19, in relation to the miracle wrought on the impotent man; He here makes the second prominent, in connection with the supreme act indicated in ver. 29. The sentences of which He speaks are the acts of absolution or of condemnation, which He accomplishes here on earth, by saying to one: "*Thy sins are forgiven thee*," to the other: "*Thy works are evil.*" Before declaring Himself thus, Jesus meditates in Himself; He listens to the Father's voice, and only opens His mouth after He has heard. It is upon this perfect docility that He rests the infallibility of His judgments, and not upon an omniscience incompatible with His humanity: "*And*—that is, and thus—*my judgment is just.*" But there is a condition necessary for listening and hearing in this way; it is to have no will of one's own; hence the ὅτι (*because*), which follows. No doubt, Jesus, Himself also, has a natural will distinct from that of God; His prayer in Gethsemane clearly proves it: "*Not my will, but thine be done.*" But, in a being entirely consecrated to God, as Jesus was, this natural will (*my* will), exists only to be unceasingly submitted or sacrificed to the Father's will: "*I seek not* mine own will, but the will of Him that hath sent me." From the ontological point of view, the Monothelites, therefore, well deserved to be condemned; for in denying to Jesus a will distinct from that of God, they suppressed the human nature in Him. And yet morally speaking, they were right. For all self-will in Jesus was a will continually and freely sacrificed. It is on this unceasing submission that the absolute holiness of His life rests, and from this holiness it is that the infallibility of His knowledge and His words results. He declares this here Himself.—The τοῦ πέμψαντός με *of Him who sent me*, is not a mere paraphrase of the name of God. It is argumentative: the one sent does the work of the sender.

What an existence is that of which this passage, vv. 19–30, traces for us the type! Such a relationship with God must have been lived, in order to be thus described: to act only after having seen, to speak only after having heard, what a picture of filial consciousness, of filial teaching, of filial activity! And all this attaching itself to a mere healing, accomplished on the initiative of the Father! Do we not see clearly that the essential idea of ver. 17 is that of the relation of dependence of the Son's

work towards the Father's, and by no means that of the Sabbath, of which not the least mention is made in all this development? At the same time, this passage gives us, so to speak, access even to the inner laboratory of our Lord's thought and allows us to study the manner in which His word was produced. The miracle performed and the accusations which He excites awaken His reflection. He collects Himself, and the profound relation of His work to that of His Father formulates itself in His consciousness in the form of that simple, summary, oracle-like thesis of ver. 17. This is the theme which He develops afterwards. At the first moment (vv. 19, 20), He remains in the highest generalities of the paternal and filial relation. Then there are precisely formulated in His thought the two essential works which result from this relation: *making alive, judging* (vv. 21–23); finally, those two works themselves are presented to His mind in a more and more concrete form, in their progressive historical realization; first in the *moral* domain (vv. 24–27), then in that of *external* realities (vv. 28, 29). Where in this incomparable passage is what is called *religious metaphysics?* From the first word to the last, everything breathes that sentiment of filial abnegation which is the heart of Jesus' heart.

II. *The testimony of the Father, in support of that which the Son renders to Himself:* vv. 31–40.

Jesus had just ascribed to Himself marvelous works. Such declarations might provoke an objection among His hearers: "All that which thou affirmest of thyself has no other guaranty than thine own word." Jesus acknowledges that His testimony has need of a divine sanction (vv. 31–35); and He presents it to His adversaries in a double testimony of the Father: 1. That of His miracles (ver. 36); 2. And that which is found from old time in the Scriptures (vv. 37–40).

Vv. 31, 32. "*If I bear witness of myself, my witness is not true.* 32. *There is another that beareth witness of me; and I know*[1] *that the witness which he witnesseth of me is true.*" Perhaps ver. 31 is the answer to an objection which was actually made to Jesus, in consequence of the preceding words. Similar interruptions abound in the much more circumstantial narratives of the following chapters. No doubt, the testimony which a person bears on his own behalf may be perfectly true. But in the sphere of sinful men, such a testimony is always suspected of partiality or falsehood. Jesus speaks here from the point of view of His hearers, who regard Him as an ordinary man. In the saying of viii. 14, on the contrary, He resumes His normal position and will claim distinctly the exceptional authority which His perfect holiness confers upon Him. The ἐγώ, *I*, might signify here: "I *alone* (apart from every other witness)." It is better to understand it: "I myself, bearing witness of my own person." Everything which follows proves that this *other*, whose testimony Jesus is about to allege, is God, and not John the Baptist, as *de Wette* thought. Vv. 33–35 are intended precisely to set aside the application of this saying

[1] ℵ D Itala Syrcur read οἴδατε (*ye know*), instead of οἶδα (*I know*).

to the forerunner. In the second clause of ver. 32, this word: *I know:* signifies: "I bear in myself the inward consciousness of that filial relation of which my Father bears witness." He means to say that for Himself He has no need of any testimony. The reading οἴδατε, *you know*, probably arises from the false application of these words to the testimony of John the Baptist. The expressions περὶ ἐμοῦ, περὶ ἐμαυτοῦ, *concerning me, concerning myself*, repeated three times (vv. 31, 32) do not mean: *in my favor, for me* (*Rilliet*), but quite simply: *respecting me.* Before saying who *this other* is, whose testimony serves to support His own, Jesus removes the supposition that it is to the testimony of the forerunner that He means to appeal.

Vv. 33–35. "*Ye have sent unto John, and he hath borne witness unto the truth.* 34. *But the witness which I receive, is not from man; and what I say unto you here, is to the end that ye may be saved.* 35. *He was the lamp that burneth and shineth; and ye were willing to rejoice for a season in his light.*" The testimony of John the Baptist had made so much noise that Jesus might suppose that, at the moment when He was saying: "I have another witness," every one would think of that personage. Jesus rejects this supposition, but does so while calling attention to the fact that, from His hearers' standpoint, the testimony of John should certainly be regarded as valid; for it was they themselves who had called it forth (an allusion to the deputation, i. 19 ff.). The word *you*, ὑμεῖς, at the beginning of the verse, places the hearers in contrast to Jesus, who does not ask for human testimonies and contents himself with being able to allege that of the Father. The perfect μεμαρτύρηκε, *hath borne witness*, declares that the testimony of John preserves its value notwithstanding the disappearance of the witness (ver. 35: he *was*, etc.). On this *truth* to which John bore witness, comp. i. 20, 27, 29. The ἐγὼ δέ, *but I*, of ver. 34 forms an antithesis to the *you* of ver. 33. This human testimony which they demanded, is not that by which Jesus supports the truth of His own, even though it was favorable to Him. But does Jesus regard the testimony of John the Baptist as purely human? Some interpreters escape the difficulty by translating οὐ λαμβάνω in the sense: "I do not seek" or "I am not ambitious of." This is to strain the meaning of the expression, which merely means: I do not make use of it. It is enough if we take account of the article τήν before the word *testimony*; "*the* testimony," means here: "that of which I have need, the only one which I would allege as confirmation of my own." John's testimony was designed to direct their eyes to the light; but, when once the light had appeared, it gave place to the direct testimony of God Himself. That testimony was, indeed, the fruit of a revelation; but, as *Keil* says, this inspiration, passing through human lips, might be called in question. Nevertheless, Jesus recalls, in passing, this testimony of John. It is the care which He has for their souls, which does not permit Him to pass it over in silence: "If I recall it, it is to the end that *you* (ὑμεῖς) may profit by it unto salvation. It is, then, for you, not for me."

The 35th verse expresses the transitory character of the appearance

of John the Baptist. John was not *the light*, the sun (i. 8); but he was *the torch*, lighted by God for giving light before the day came. The article *the* before the word *torch* has been explained in many ways. *Bengel* finds here an allusion to Sirach xlviii. 1: "*the word* (of Elijah) *shone as a torch.*" *Luthardt* believes that John is compared to *the* well-known torch-bearer, who ordinarily preceded the bridegroom in the marriage feasts. *Meyer*, *Weiss*, *Keil*, understand: *the true* torch which is designed to show the path. Perhaps there is an allusion to that *single* light which was lighted at night to illumine the house (Mark iv. 21). We might see in the two epithets: *which burneth and shineth*, only this one idea: which is consumed in shining. But it is more simple to find here the two conditions of the usefulness of the light: to be lighted and not to be covered (Weiss). The imperfect ἦν, *was*, proves that, at the moment when Jesus was speaking, the light was already covered. For there is evidently an allusion in this past tense to the imprisonment of John the Baptist. The second part of the verse: *Ye were willing* . . . . , continues the figure. Jesus compares the Jews to children who, instead of making use of the precious moments during which the light shines, do nothing but frolic in its brightness. *To rejoice* is contrasted with *to be saved*, ver. 34. It was impossible better to characterize the vain and puerile curiosity, with which the people were infatuated by an appearance so extraordinary. Comp. Luke vii. 24: "*What went ye out into the wilderness to see?*" *Weiss* thinks that Jesus meant to indicate the hopes which had at first been excited in the rulers by this appearance. Can this be in accordance with Luke vii. 30?—Ἠθελήσατε: *you pleased yourselves with* . . .

Ver. 36. "*But I have the*[1] *witness which is greater*[2] *than* [*that of*] *John: for the works which the Father hath given*[3] *me to accomplish, these very works that I do*[4] *bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me.*" The passage relating to John the Baptist was only a remark thrown in in a passing way, an argument *ad hominem;* Jesus now develops the fact announced at first, ver. 32: the testimony of the Father. The ἐγώ, *I*, is like that of ver. 34, the antithesis of *you*, ver. 33; it completes the preceding by adding the affirmation to the negation. For the article *the*, see on ver. 34: the absolute witness, the only one to which I wish to appeal here.

The absence of the article before μείζω is explained thus: "*the* true testimony, which is *a* testimony greater than." In the genitive τοῦ Ἰωάννου, *of John*, is ordinarily found the abbreviated form of comparison: "greater than *that* of John." May it not be explained more literally: "greater *than John*," that is to say, than John testifying in my favor: John identified with his testimony. *Meyer*, *Weiss*, *Keil*, *Reuss*, etc., understand by the ἔργα, *the works* of which Jesus speaks, His whole activity in general, and not only His miracles. *Weiss* alleges for this meaning the whole passage vv. 20–27 on the spiritual resurrection of humanity. But the spiritual works of Jesus do not come under the perception of the

[1] ℵ omits την before μαρτυριαν.
[2] A B E G M Λ read μειζον (evidently a mistake).
[3] ℵ B L Γ read δεδωκεν, instead of εδωκεν.
[4] ℵ A B D L some Mnn. reject εγω before ποιω.

senses; in order to believe them, they must have been experienced; they are not, therefore, a *testimony* for the unbeliever. Moreover, at the moment when Jesus was speaking, they were still to come. Finally, we must not forget the starting-point of this whole discourse, which is a miracle properly so called. Jesus certainly alludes to the healing of the impotent man and to all the similar works which He is accomplishing every day. *Meyer* concedes this explanation in the passages vii. 3, 21 and elsewhere; but the context demands it here as well as there. The miracles are designated, on the one side, as *gifts* of the Father to Jesus; on the other, as *works* of Jesus Himself. And it is, in fact, by this double right, that they are a testimony of God. If the Son did them by His own force, they would not be a declaration of God on His behalf; and if God performed them directly, without passing through the Son as an organ, the latter could not derive from them a personal legitimation.—We may hesitate between the readings ἔδωκε and δέδωκε, both of which are compatible with the following ἵνα τελειώσω. The object of this verb *hath given* is: *the works;* God makes a gift to Jesus of His miracles. Then this object is developed by these words: (literally) *that I may accomplish them.* For these miracles are not given to Him in the form of works *done*, but of works *to be done.* This is brought out forcibly by the repetition of the subject in the words: *these very works which I* (ἐγώ) *do.* The expression *give in order that* includes both permission and power. As it is from this double character of the miracle, as a *gift* of God and a *work* of Jesus, that the testimony results, it is necessary to keep in the text the word ἐγώ, *I*, before ποιῶ, which is rejected by some Alexandrian authorities, and which well sets forth the second of these two characteristics. But this testimony of the miracles is still indirect, as compared with another which is altogether personal (ver. 37):

Ver. 37. "*And the Father who sent me, himself*[1] *hath borne witness of me. Ye have neither heard his voice at any time, nor seen his form.*" It is clear, whatever *Olshausen*, *Baur* and others may say, that Jesus here speaks of a *new* testimony of the Father: otherwise, why should He substitute for the present *beareth witness* (ver. 36), which applies to the miracles which Jesus at present performs, the perfect *hath borne witness*, which can only denote a testimony given and completed.—The pronoun αὐτός, *Himself*, emphasized as it is, strongly sets forth the *personal* character of this new testimony: God has spoken *Himself.* This is the reason why the reading αὐτός seems to me preferable to the ἐκεῖνος, *he*, of the Alexandrian authorities. What is this personal testimony? *De Wette* and *Tholuck*, understand by it the inner voice by which God testifies in *the heart* of man in favor of the Gospel, "*the drawing of the Father* to the Son." But it is impossible from this point of view to explain the perfect *hath borne witness*, and very difficult to account for the following expressions, *His voice*, *His form*, which so evidently refer to a personal manifestation. *Chrysostom*, *Grotius*, *Bengel* (I myself, in the former editions), refer this expression to the testimony of

[1] ℵ B L. am. read εκεινος, instead of αυτος; D: εκεινος αυτος.

God at the *baptism* of Jesus, which very well answers to this condition. But objection is rightly made because of the οὐ . . . πώποτε, *never*, in the following words: and it would be to return to the testimony of John the Baptist, which Jesus had set aside, since the voice of God had not been heard except by the forerunner and everything rested, therefore, upon his testimony. We must, accordingly, take our position rather with the explanation of *Cyril, Calvin, Lücke, Meyer, Luthardt, Weiss, Keil*, who refer ver. 37 to the testimony of God *in the Old Testament*, the book in which He manifests Himself and Himself speaks. Vv. 38, 39 confirm this view. But how, from this point of view, can we explain the following clause? A reproach has been found here (*Meyer, Luthardt, Keil*); "You are miserably deaf and blind, that is, incapable of apprehending this testimony; you have never inwardly received the divine word." This sense suits the context. But the expression: "*You have not seen his face*" would be a strange one to designate moral insensibility to the Holy Scriptures. Others see rather in these words a *concession* made to the hearers: for example, *Tholuck:* "You have, no doubt, neither heard . . . nor seen . . . , for that is impossible; it is not this with which I reproach you (ver. 37); but you should at least have received the testimony which God gives in the Scriptures" (ver. 38). If this were the thought, however, an adversative particle could not be wanting at the beginning of ver. 38. But the expression: *and you have not in you*, on the contrary, continues the movement of the preceding clause. The expressions *to hear the voice, see the form of God*, denote an immediate personal knowledge of God (i. 18). Jesus uses the former in vi. 46, to characterize the knowledge of God which He has Himself, in contrast with all purely human knowledge: "*Not that any one hath seen the Father, save He that is of the Father; he hath seen the Father.*" This declaration ought to serve as a standard for the explanation of the one before us. We shall say with *Weiss:* There is not here either a reproach or a concession; it is the simple authentication of a fact, namely, the natural powerlessness of man to rise to the intuitive knowledge of God. The thought of Jesus is, therefore: "This personal testimony of God (ver. 37a) has not reached you, first because no divine revelation or appearance has been personally given to you, as to the prophets and men of God in the Old Testament (ver. 37b); and then because the word to which those men of God consigned their immediate communications with God, has not become living and abiding in you (ver. 38)." Consequently the personal testimony of God, that which Jesus here means, does not exist for them. God has never spoken to them directly, and the only book, in which they could have heard His testimony, has remained for them, through their own fault, a closed book. We can well understand why in ver. 37 Jesus employs the term φωνή, the personal *voice*, the symbol of immediate revelation, while in ver. 38 He makes use of the word λόγος, *word*, the term in use to denote the *revelation* handed down to the people. The direct connection of ver. 37 with ver. 38 by καί, *and*, presents no more difficulty from this point of view.

Vv. 38–40. "*And his word ye have not abiding in you, for ye believe not*

him whom he hath sent. 39. *Ye search the Scriptures, because ye think that in them ye have eternal life; and these are they which bear witness of me.* 40. *And ye will not come to me that ye may have life.*" The written word might have supplied the place of the personal revelation; they have had it in their hands and on their lips, but not in the heart. They have studied the letter, but have not appropriated to themselves the contents, the thought, the spirit. Thus it has not become a light lighted within them to guide them, a power to bear sway over them. Jesus gives a proof of this inward fact—it is their unbelief towards Him, the divine messenger. Undoubtedly, there is no *argument* here; for the reality of His divine mission was precisely the point in question. It is a *judgment* which Jesus pronounces, and which has its point of support, like the entire discourse, in the miracle which He had wrought.

The 39th verse may be regarded as a concession: No doubt, you study the Scriptures with care. But we must rather see herein the indication of a fact which Jesus is about to contrast with another. "You search the Scriptures with so much care; you scrutinize the externals of them with the most scrupulous exactness, hoping to make eternal life spring forth from this minute study; and at the same time you obstinately reject the one to whom they bear testimony!" We take the verb ἐρευνᾶτε, therefore, as an indicative: *you search;* as do *Cyril, Erasmus, Bengel, Lücke, Westcott,* and now also *Luthardt.* A large number of commentators and translators (*Chrysostom, Augustine, Luther, Calvin, Stier, Hofmann, Keil, Osterwald,*) make this verb an imperative: *Search.* Jesus would exhort them to a profound study of the Scriptures. But, in that case, He should not have said, "because you *believe* you have in them . . .," but "because you will have in them;" or at least "because you *yourselves* think you have in them." And then He should have continued, in order to give a ground for the exhortation, by saying: "*For* these are *they.*" The verb ἐρευνᾶν, *search,* is very suitable as characterizing the Rabbinical study of the Scriptures, the dissection of the letter. Ἐκεῖναι, *they,* still with the emphatic and exclusive meaning which this pronoun has in John: and it is precisely *they.*

The copula καί, *and,* in ver. 40, sets forth, as so often in John, the moral contradiction between the two things which unbelief succeeds in causing to move on together: to study the Scriptures which testify of Christ, *and,* at the same time, not to come to Christ! They seek life, *and* they reject Him who brings it! The words: *ye will not,* mark the voluntary side of unbelief, the moral antipathy which is the real cause of it. We find again in this passage the sorrowful tone of that saying preserved in the Synoptics: "*Jerusalem, Jerusalem, how often would I . . . . But ye would not!*" This passage clearly shows how Jesus recognized Himself in the Old Testament. He beheld there so fully His own figure, that it seemed to Him impossible to have sincerely studied that book and not *come to Him* immediately.

But whence *arises,* then, the not willing pointed out in ver. 40, and what will be its *result?* These are the two questions which Jesus answers in

the words which close the discourse, and which are, as it were, the practical application of it.

III.—*The condemnation of Jewish unbelief:* vv. 41–47.

In vv. 41–44, Jesus unfolds the cause of the moral antipathy which keeps them away from Him; in vv. 45–47, the terrible consequences of this refusal to believe.

Vv. 41–44. "*I receive not my glory from men.* 42. *But I know you,* [*and I know*] *that ye have not the love of God in yourselves.* 43. *I am come in my Father's name, and ye receive me not; if another shall come in*[1] *his own name, him ye will receive.* 44. *How can ye believe, ye who receive your glory from one another, and seek not*[2] *the glory which cometh from God*[3] *only.*"—On one side, a Messiah who has no care for the good opinion of men and the homage of the multitude, and on the other, men who place their supreme good in public consideration, in an unblemished reputation for orthodoxy, in a high renown for Scriptural erudition and for fidelity to legal observances (comp. the description of the Pharisees, Matt. vi. 1–18; xxiii. 1–12): how could this opposition in tendency fail to put an obstacle in the way of the birth of faith in these latter? *Weiss* thinks that, if this were the sense of ver. 41, an ἐγώ, *I*, would be necessary, in contrast with *you* (ver. 42). In the same manner with *Westcott*, he understands in this way: Do not think that I am speaking thus "in order to glorify myself in your eyes" (*Weiss*); or: "as the result of spite which my disappointed hopes cause me" (*Westcott*). But the ἐγώ would be necessary only if the case of Jesus were placed second. If Jesus had meant to reply to such a supposition on the part of His adversaries, He would, no doubt, have said: μὴ δοκεῖτε, "*think not that* I seek . . . . ."—The perfect ἔγνωκα means: "I have studied you, and I know you." Jesus had penetrated the depth of vanity which these fine exteriors so much admired among the rulers covered.—*The love of God* denotes the inward aspiration towards God which may be found in the Jew and even in the sincere Gentile. Rom. ii. 7: "Those who seek for honor, glory and immortality." (Comp. ver. 44.) This divine aspiration it is, which leads to faith, as the absence of it to unbelief. Jesus states precisely here the thought which is expressed in an indefinite way in iii. 19–21. *In yourselves:* not only on the lips, but in the heart.

Ver. 43. The result of this contrast between His moral tendency and theirs. While they reject Him, the Messiah, whose whole appearance bears the seal of dependence on God, they will receive with eagerness every false Messiah who will act from his own wisdom and his own force, glorifying man in his person. All glorious with the glory of this world will be the one welcomed by these lovers of human glory. *In the name of God:* coming by His authority and as His delegate. *In his own name:* representing only himself, his own genius and power. Ἐλθῃ, *comes*, in

[1] ℵ omits ἐν. [2] ℵ 10 Mnn. Italq. read ζητουντες, instead of ζητειτε. [3] B a b. omit θεου.

its relation to ἐλήλυθα, *I have come*, can only denote a pseudo-Messianic appearance. According to the Synoptics also, Jesus expected false Christs (Matt. xxiv. 5, 24 and the parallels). History has confirmed this prophecy; it speaks of sixty-four false Messiahs, who all succeeded in forming a party among the Jewish people in this way. See Schudt, *Jüdische Merkwürdigkeiten* (cited by Meyer). *You will* receive him; comp. 2 Thess. ii. 10, 11. The application of this expression; *another* to the false Messiah Bacochebas (about 132), which some critics have desired to make for the purpose of proving that the composition of our Gospel belongs to the second century (*Hilgenfeld*, *Thoma*), is an absolutely gratuitous supposition, which has no authorization in the text.

This vicious tendency with which Jesus reproaches His adversaries went so far as even to destroy in them the faculty, the *possibility* of believing: ver. 44. The pronoun, ὑμεῖς, *you*, signifies: men such as you are (vv. 42, 43). In the last words, the adjective μόνου, *only*, may be connected with the idea of θεοῦ: God who is *the only God*. Jesus would, in this case, characterize God as having, as *only God*, the right to bestow the true glory. This is the meaning ordinarily given to this expression. I think that it is more in the spirit of the context to understand, with *Grotius* and *de Wette:* the glory which is received from *God alone*, from God only, and not from men. The idea of these verses is that nothing renders men more unfit for faith than the seeking for human glory. But as necessarily as the current of Pharisaic vainglory bears the rulers of the people far away from faith, so infallibly would the spirit of love for God which inspires the books of Moses have directed them to Jesus and led them to faith.

Vv. 45–47. "*Think not that I will accuse you to the Father: there is one that accuseth you,*[1] *Moses, on whom ye have set your hope.* 46. *For if ye believed Moses, ye would believe me; for he wrote*[2] *of me.* 47. *But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe*[3] *my words.*" After having unveiled to them the moral *cause* of their unbelief, Jesus shows to His hearers the *danger* to which it exposes them,—that of being condemned in the name of that very law, on the observance of which they have founded their hopes of salvation. It is not He, the Messiah rejected by them, it is Moses himself, in whose name they condemn Him, who will demand their condemnation. Jesus pursues them here on their own ground. His word assumes an aggressive and dramatic form. He causes to rise before them that grand figure of the ancient deliverer, to whom their hopes were attached (εἰς ὃν), and transforms this alleged advocate into an accuser. The words: *that I will accuse you*, show that, already at that time, a sentiment of hostility to His own people was imputed to Jesus. It was His severe discourses which gave rise to this accusation. Ἔστι, is very solemn: "*He is there*, he who . . . " The words: *on whom you hope*, allude to the zeal for the law, which the adversaries of Jesus had manifested on this very

1 B adds προς τον πατερα (*to the Father*).
2 ℵ: γεγραφεν instead of εγραψεν.
3 Instead of πιστευσετε, B Y It$^{\text{Italiq}}$ Syr$^{\text{cur}}$ read πιστευετε and D G S Δ some Mnn. πιστευσητε.

day; this zeal was their title, in their eyes an assured title, to the Messianic glory. "It will be found that this Moses, whom you invoke against me will testify *for* me *against* you." What an overturning of all their ideas! *Meyer* and *Weiss* claim that the words: *who will accuse you* cannot refer to the *last judgment*, since Jesus will then fill the office, not of accuser, but of judge. But Jesus does not enter into this question, which would have had no meaning with people who did not recognize Him as the Messiah. *To the* Father: who will judge by means of Christ.

The two verses, 46 and 47, prove the thesis of ver. 45, by showing, the first, the connection between faith in Moses and faith in Christ; the second, the no less necessary connection between the two unbeliefs in the one and in the other. In other words: Every true disciple of Moses is on the way to becoming a Christian; every bad Jew is on that towards rejecting the Gospel. These two propositions are founded on the principle that the two covenants are the development of one and the same fundamental thought and have the same moral substance. To accept or reject the revelation of salvation at its first stage, is implicitly to accept or reject it in its complete form. This is exactly the thesis which St. Paul develops in Rom. ii. 6–10 and 26–29. The words: *wrote of me*, allude to the Proto-gospel, to the patriarchal promises, to the types such as that of the brazen serpent, to the Levitical ceremonies which were *the shadow of things to come* (Col. ii. 17), more especially to the promise Deut. xviii. 18: "*I will raise up unto them a prophet like unto thee;*"—this last promise, while including the sending of all the prophets who followed Moses, finds its consummation in Jesus Christ.—*Ye would believe on me:* in me as the one whom Moses thus announced. In truth, many of the prophecies had not yet found in Jesus their fulfillment. But we must think especially of the spirit of holiness in the law of Moses and the theocratic institutions, which found in Jesus its full realization. Moses tended to awaken the sense of sin and the thirst for righteousness, which Jesus came to satisfy. "To give access to this spirit, was to open one's heart in advance to the great life-giver" (*Gess*).

Ver. 47. On the other hand, unbelief towards Moses carries naturally in its train the rejection of Jesus. The essential antithesis is not that of the substantives, *writings* and *words*, but that of the pronouns, *his* and *my*. The former is only accidental; it arises only from the fact that the Jews knew Moses by his *writings* and Jesus by His *words*. This charge of not believing Moses, addressed to people whom the alleged violation of one of the Mosaic commandments threw into a rage, recalls that other saying of Jesus, so sorrowful and so bitter (Matt. xxiii. 29–32): "*Ye build the tombs of the prophets, and ye bear witness thus that ye are children of those who killed them.*" The rejection of a sacred principle shelters itself sometimes under the appearances of the most particular regard and most ardent zeal for the principle itself. From this coincidence, there result, in the religious history of humanity, those tragic situations, among which the catastrophe of Israel here announced certainly holds the foremost place.

As regards the historical reality of this discourse, the following appear to us to be the results of the exegesis:

1. The *fundamental thought* is perfectly suited to the *given situation*. Accused of having done an anti-Sabbatical work, and even of ascribing to Himself equality with God, Jesus justifies Himself in a way at once the most lofty and the most humble, by averring, on the testimony of His consciousness, the absolute dependence of His work, relatively to that of the Father.

2. The *three* principal *parts* of the discourse are naturally *linked together*, as they start from the central idea which we have just indicated: 1. Jesus affirms the constant adapting of His activity to that of the Father, and declares that from this relation of dependence between Him and God will proceed yet far more considerable works. 2. He proves this internal relation, which it is impossible for men to test, by a double testimony of the Father: His miracles, a specimen of which is at this very moment before their eyes, and the Scriptures. 3. He closes by showing them, in their secret antipathy to the moral tendency of His work, the reason which prevents them from trusting the divine testimony, and by declaring to them their future condemnation in the name of that Moses whom they accuse Him of despising.

Instead of the abstruse metaphysics which has been charged upon the discourses in John, there remains for us only the simple expression of the filial consciousness of Jesus. This latter displays itself gradually in a series of views of imposing grandeur, and of an unique elevation. What renders this feature more striking, is the *naive* and almost child-like simplicity of the figures employed to describe this communion of the Son with the Father. Such a relation must have been *lived*, in order to be expressed, and expressed in this way.

Strauss has acknowledged, up to a certain point, these results of exegesis. "There is not," he says, "in the tenor of the rest of the discourse, anything which causes difficulty, anything which Jesus could not Himself have said, since the evangelist relates, in the best connection, things . . . which, according to the Synoptics also, Jesus ascribes to Himself."[1] The objections of Strauss bear only on the analogies of style between this discourse, that of John the Baptist (chap. iii.), and certain passages of the first Epistle of St. John (Introd., pp. 106, 107). Strauss concludes by saying: "If, then, the form of this discourse should be ascribed to the evangelist, it might be that the substance of it belonged to Jesus." We believe that we may conclude by saying: Jesus must have really spoken in this way. The principal theme bears the character of most perfect appropriateness. The secondary ideas are logically subordinated to this theme. No detail turns aside from the idea of the whole, or goes beyond it; finally, the application is of a thrilling solemnity, as it should be in such a situation, and closes by impressing on the whole discourse the seal of reality.

Renan considers that the author of this narrative must have derived the substance of his account from tradition, which is, he says, *extremely weighty*, because it proves that a part of the Christian community really attributed to Jesus miracles performed at Jerusalem. As to the discourse in particular, see his summary judgment respecting the discourses of the fourth Gospel (p. lxxviii.): "The

[1] *Leben Jesu*, I., 2d part. The expression "in the rest of the discourse" is not intended to limit this favorable judgment given respecting the whole of the discourse; it applies to an exception which Strauss had himself just set aside.

theme cannot be without a certain degree of authenticity; but in the execution, the fancy of the artist gives itself full play. We feel the factitious action, the rhetoric, the studied diction." But *factitious action* betrays itself by commonplaces without appropriateness; have we met with them? *Rhetoric*, by emphasis and inflation; have we found a redundant word, a word which does not express an original thought? *Studied diction*, by the ingenious antithesis or the striving after piquancy; has the discourse which we have just studied offered us anything like this? The substance and the force equally exclude the idea of an artificial work, of a composition in cold blood.

Finally, let us notice an assertion of *Réville*, trenchant and bold like those which so often come from the pen of this critic: "This book," he says, in speaking of the fourth Gospel, "in which Judaism, the Jewish law, the Jewish temples, are things as foreign, as indifferent, as they could be to a Hellenistic Christian of the second century . . . "[1] And one ventures to write words like these in the face of the last verses of this chapter, in which Jesus so identifies His teaching with that of Moses, that to believe the one is implicitly to believe the other, and to reject the second, is virtually to reject the first, because Jesus is in reality nothing but Moses completed. The agreement of the law and the Gospel does not appear more clearly from the Sermon on the Mount, than from the passage which we have just studied. But we know that the Sermon on the Mount is universally regarded as that which has most authenticity in the Synoptic tradition.

[1] *Revue germanique*, I., Dec. 1863, p. 120, note.

INTRODUCTORY SUGGESTIONS

WITH REFERENCE TO

THE INTERNAL EVIDENCE.

BY THE AMERICAN EDITOR.

THE intelligent reader of the New Testament, when he comes to the Fourth Gospel, is at once impressed by the difference between it and the three narratives of the life of Jesus which precede it. Each of these earlier writings, though having certain peculiarities of its own which distinguish it from the other two, is, in some prominent sense, a biography written for the purpose of telling the story itself. If there is a further end in view, as undoubtedly there may be, it is rather secondary than primary, or, to say the least, it is left to the reader to discover, without any direct statement of it on the author's part. But one cannot open the Fourth Gospel and read the verses of its first chapter without realizing that the book has a new character. The writer is evidently moving in the sphere of great thoughts, and not merely of a biographical narrative. He is evidently intending to relate his story for an end which is beyond the mere record. He does not mean to commit his book to those who may chance to receive it, and then let them find in the works or words of Jesus whatever idea of His person or influences for their own spiritual life they may be able to discover for themselves. He has, on the other hand, a thought of his own. He has studied the life of the Master for himself, and he would impress, if possible, upon the mind of his reader the conviction which has been impressed upon his own.

What is this conviction? What is this purpose? These are the questions which immediately present themselves. The phenomena brought before us in the book, and the direct statements, if there be any such, which it contains, must furnish the answer. If we look for these—reading carefully from the beginning to the end—we discover, first of all, the remarkable declarations of what is commonly called the Prologue, and the equally striking words of xx. 30, 31, which close the work. What is, if

possible, still more remarkable, we find that, while the words and propositions which evidently hold the most prominent place in the Prologue disappear altogether after it reaches its termination, the last verses of the twentieth chapter, just alluded to, have a manifest connection with these propositions and words. These last verses, also, clearly set forth the purpose of the book. The phenomena of this Gospel are, therefore, the great thoughts of the introductory verses respecting the Logos, the story of Jesus which forms the substance and contents of the book, and the formal declaration, at the end, that the author's object in writing is to induce the readers to believe with regard to Jesus that which, as he cannot doubt, will give them the true life of the soul. In a word, he is moved to write a new Gospel narrative, not merely to tell once more, or in a somewhat different way, a story which had been told before, but in order that, by telling it, he may prove to his readers the truth of his own conception of his Master, and that they, by this means, may attain to the highest good.

Let us consider the Prologue briefly with reference to the plan of the work.[1] There can be little doubt that the two leading ideas of the first eighteen verses are those of ver. 1 and ver. 14: The Logos was in the beginning, was with God, and was God; and the Logos became flesh and tabernacled among us. In connection with the first of these statements, certain additional declarations, evidently of a subordinate character, are made in vv. 3, 4; The Logos was the instrumental agent in creation; with reference to the living part of created things He was the life; and with respect to the part capable of intelligence and spiritual life He was the light. He was thus the source of all existence, of any sort, which any portion of the creation is able to possess. That there is a steady movement and progress here in the line of the idea of revelation seems evident. The movement is towards the spiritual region, and naturally so, because it is in that region that the author's mind is dwelling. These earliest verses, therefore, indicate what the word Logos in itself indicates, whatever may be its origin—whether the Old Testament or the Jewish-Alexandrian philosophy—namely, that the thought of John is of God as revealing Himself to and in the world, as distinguished from God in His unrevealed state or His hidden being. The Logos is the revealer. This revealer was working in the world, from the beginning, to the end of giving the true light, but the world did not fully lay hold of what He offered to it.

[1] For a more detailed setting forth of the ideas of the Prologue and the meaning of its leading words, see additional notes.

"The light shineth in the darkness; and the darkness apprehended it not." Some clearer mode of manifesting Himself as manifesting also the light became, therefore, a necessity; and, accordingly, the Logos became flesh. Without attempting to determine, at this point, precisely what the author's idea, in the use of these words, is, we cannot doubt that he intends to represent the Logos as, in some way, coming into human life in the person of a man. This is made clear, not only by the contrast of the words σάρξ ἐγένετο with the propositions of the first verse, but also by the peculiar phrase ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν and by the words *we beheld his glory, glory as of the only begotten from the Father*. Finally, the immediate connection of vv. 17, 18 with ver. 14, through the words *grace and truth* and the verb ἐξηγήσατο which carries in it the idea of revelation, show that the person in whom the Logos, in some sense, took up His abode for the purpose of giving the clearer light which men needed was Jesus Christ. The substance of the statement of the Prologue is, accordingly, that—in some way, which it is not necessary at this point of our discussion to discover and definitely establish—Jesus Christ is the Logos who was in the beginning with God and was God, and who, at a later period, became flesh. The narrative of the earthly life of Jesus which occupies the space intervening between the Prologue and the closing verses—that is, which really forms the substance of the work—is the means which the author adopts for the accomplishment of his purpose. The story is the proof. Instead of establishing his proposition that Jesus is the Logos incarnate by arguments appropriate to a doctrinal treatise, he simply gives the narrative of what He did and said, evidently believing that the life will bear the strongest testimony to the doctrine.

That he should have adopted this method of proof was natural, because the establishment of the doctrinal proposition in itself considered was not the final end which he had in view. This end was, as he himself states, a practical one, to be realized in the life of his readers. They were to have life in the name of this incarnate Logos. But this life (ζωή) was not merely to the view of this writer a thing of the future, to be experienced in eternity. It was a present experience of the individual soul—the life of Jesus transferred, as it were, to the believing disciple and made a possession of his own. There could be no better way, therefore, of accomplishing his twofold purpose—the doctrinal and the practical—than to lead the reader to believe the truth that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, by giving the narrative of His earthly career.

There are, however, two peculiar elements in the narrative which fur-

ther distinguish it from the narratives of the Synoptical Gospels. The first of these is immediately connected with the doctrinal character of the book. As the story is told for the purpose of proving the truth just mentioned, it is viewed everywhere by the author in the light of testimony. The Greek word which conveys the idea of testimony occurs in this Gospel in its verbal form thirty-three times, and in its substantive form fourteen times. It is found in almost every chapter, and almost universally with reference to Jesus. Very singularly it appears in two places in the Prologue as bringing out the witness borne by John the Baptist—once, immediately after the first leading statement respecting the Logos (vv. 1–4), and again, after the second leading statement (ver. 14). Then, at the opening of the historical section of the first chapter, it is introduced a third time with a detailed setting forth of what the Baptist said. It is plain that the biography is, as we may say, founded upon testimony; and the simplest, or even the only explanation which can be given, as regards the Prologue, is that the author desired to connect each of His two great propositions with that witness of the forerunner which was, in a sense, the accrediting word from God Himself. We find the word, also, in those central and vital chapters of the first main division of the book—the fifth and the eighth,—in which the evidences for His claims to Divine Sonship are given by Jesus Himself, and pressed upon the attention of His adversaries. Testimony turns the minds and footsteps of the earliest disciples to Jesus. The believer becomes immediately a witness, as we see, for example, in the case of the Samaritan woman. The apostolic work in the present and the future is to be that of testifying. The words and works which Jesus speaks and does bear testimony to Him. The Spirit who shall appear after He is glorified shall be always giving His divine witness. The author himself writes his book as one who has seen and testified. When we discover this idea thus filling the book, and observe at the end that the writer has evidently selected his materials, excluding much that he might have inserted (" many other signs, etc., which are not written in this book "), we may not doubt that his principle of selection was connected with this idea.

The second of the two elements referred to appears first in the verses which follow the Prologue and which extend as far as the middle of the second chapter. This passage may be called the historical introduction of the Gospel. It will be noticed by the attentive reader that the entrance of Jesus on His public ministry, as given in this book, is described in ii. 13 ff. The passage i. 19–ii. 12 contains only an account of the coming

of five or six persons to Jesus while He was still continuing in His private and family life. The story, as related to these persons, opens with the mention of two, one of whom only is named, who were directed to Jesus by John the Baptist and apparently came to Him at John's suggestion. If we observe closely the record of John's testimony, we shall see that there are not three independent statements of it (i. 19–28; 29–34; 35 f.), which are given merely for the purpose of making known what he said. But, on the contrary, there is a manifest movement from the first to the third, in such a way as to show that it is for the sake of the last that the other two are introduced. When John says to the two disciples in ver. 36, "Behold the Lamb of God," the absence of all further words makes it evident that he must have given a more full explanation of the term on a previous occasion. The mind of the reader is thus carried back immediately to the preceding day (ver. 29), when he said: "Behold the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sin of the world," and then added the account of the way in which he came to know at the baptism of Jesus that He was indeed the Lamb of God. This was the declaration and this the explanation which they needed to make them ready, when they saw Him again, to go to Him and form His acquaintance. But, as John tells the company around him on that second day that Jesus whose office is to take away sin is the one of whom he had said, After me cometh a man who is etc., and that he had himself come baptizing with water in order that this greater one might be made manifest to Israel, the thought is again carried back to the witness which had been borne on the first day (ver. 26, comp. also ver. 15). The first day is thus preparatory to the second, and the second to the third. The whole story centres upon the two disciples, and the Baptist's testimony is given because of its bearing upon them. The writer, indeed, suggests this even by the careful marking of the successive days, which, as related to the testimony considered in itself alone, could scarcely have any importance. The result of the testimony in the life of those who receive it is thus distinctly brought before us; and, as in the *μαρτυρία* of ver. 19, which is unfolded in the following verses, we have the beginning of the proof that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God, xx. 31a, so in the case of these disciples we find the first beginning of that gaining of life in His name through faith which is the practical end to be secured by the proof, xx. 31b. Answering to the element of testimony, therefore, we discover that of experience.

But this experience is confined to five or six persons. Indeed, in the verses for which the record of John's testimony prepares the way (35–40),

it is limited to two. There can be no doubt that the story of these two persons is the starting-point from which the whole narrative of the life of Jesus is developed. Instead of beginning, as Matthew and Luke do, with an account of Jesus' birth and genealogy, or as Mark does, with His baptism and entrance upon His public work, this writer takes his departure from a brief interview which these two disciples of John the Baptist had with Him, and the first impressions produced upon their minds by what they heard Him say. They communicate their impressions to one or two others and persuade them to come to Jesus. Two more are gained as disciples on the next day, and then the little company go to the wedding-feast at Cana, where their faith is strengthened by a miracle. Then the public life and work of Jesus begin. But there is abundant evidence that the record of this public life and work, as given by the author, has constant reference to the disciples, and, at the end, he sums up the whole book by the statement, that, while Jesus did many other signs in the presence of His disciples which are not written here, these signs—these σημεῖα (or miraculous proofs of what He was) which He did in their presence—are written, etc. The plan of this Gospel in relation to this point is certainly very remarkable, as compared with that of the Synoptics or with the ordinary plan of a biography. No reasonable explanation can be given of it, except as we hold that the writer intended to connect the evidences that Jesus was the Logos with the new life and faith of these disciples. But, more than this,—the opening story points to *individual* experience. How are we to account for the placing of such a little narrative at the beginning of the whole biography—for the development, in a certain sense, of everything out of it? The narrative seems so insignificant in itself as to make it improbable that an ordinary historian would find it even arresting his attention. It is presented with little or no detail. One of the characters in it is, so far as the reader discovers from the words of the story itself, unknown even by name. Andrew and some one else, we know not who, went to Jesus on a certain afternoon and spent two hours with Him, and began to believe in Him as the Messiah. This is all. But on this the future narrative, the entire book, is founded. How impossible it seems, that a writer of another century, or removed entirely from the experience and life of the apostles, should have opened his work in this way. If, now, the author was himself the unnamed disciple, if that brief conversation with Jesus was the beginning of his own faith, if the new life came into being in his soul on that afternoon and thus the event here mentioned was the deciding point of his per-

sonal history, everything is made clear. The little story rises into marked significance. It may well be the foundation for all that follows. The author gives the record of the life of Jesus *as he had known it*. He says to his readers, Let me tell you of that wonderful man whom I lived with years ago, of what I heard Him say and saw Him do. Let me carry you back to the hour when I first became acquainted with Him, and take you along with me through the subsequent history. Let me show you how I came to believe and how I grew in my belief, and I hope that the story as I give it may lead you also to believe with an earnest and saving faith. But, if the writer was not the unnamed disciple, if, on the other hand, he had never seen Jesus or the apostles, and knew only the life of a hundred years later, this story has no meaning and its insertion is inexplicable. The whole book, as related to its beginning, is a mystery, if this meeting with Jesus was not a vital thing in the author's own life. It breaks forth into clearness and light and has a wonderful naturalness and power, so soon as we find the writer of the narrative in the disciple whose name is not given.

The fact that the element of personal experience is an important one in the book, and indeed that it is centered, as it were, upon the experience of the writer himself, is made evident also by other indications. Among these the following may be particularly mentioned.

1. The great prominence given to the word πιστεύειν. This word which occurs only thirty-five times in the three Synoptic Gospels, and one hundred and three times from the beginning of Acts to the end of Revelation (excluding John's first Epistle), is found ninety-eight times in this Gospel. Around it the whole narrative turns. As the words and works of Jesus, the declarations of John, the preaching of the Apostles, the work of the Spirit, the Scriptures and the voice of God, are all viewed in the light of testimony, so everywhere the attitude of men towards this testimony is marked by the verb πιστεύειν. If they receive the witness which is borne to Christ, they are said to believe. If they reject it, they do not believe. If they are partly influenced by it, but yet not affected in the inmost principle of their life, they are described as believing (ἐπίστευσαν), but not so that Jesus could trust Himself to them (οὐκ ἐπίστευεν αὐτὸν αὐτοῖς, ii. 23, 24, comp. viii. 31 ff.). If they grow in faith, as in the case of the Twelve, they are repeatedly spoken of as believing—the indications of the context being, with each repetition, that the word has a growing fullness of meaning. If the final blessing of Jesus is recorded,

it is a blessing on those who have not seen and yet have believed. If the author wishes to express the purpose of his writing, it is that the readers may believe. If he desires to tell them the way of securing eternal life, it is in the words "that believing you may have life." Moreover, this ever-repeated word, in which all that is most vital to the human soul rests, is the *verb*, which expresses action, and not the *noun*. The substantive πίστις, the doctrinal word, which is so frequently used by Paul (nearly one hundred and fifty times in his Epistles), and which even occurs twenty-four times in the Synoptic Gospels, is not found in this book. The author is not moving in the sphere of doctrine, so far as the human side of truth is concerned, but of life. Indeed, as we have already seen, the very argument to prove the Divine doctrine is the life of Jesus. What can be the meaning of this striking feature of this Gospel, except that, to the author's mind, the living experience of the soul was the thing of all importance? And how exactly do the closing words, which give the object and purpose of the book (xx. 30, 31), answer to this thought—I write that you may believe the doctrine because, and only because, I know that believing is the gate-way of life.

2. Again, if we look at this verb as the author uses it with reference to the apostles, how plainly is the same thing indicated. No attentive student of this Gospel can fail to see that, as the disciples are said, again and again, at different points of the history, to believe in view of what they had seen or heard, the word *believe* gains a new fullness of meaning. There is a steady progress from the first day to the last, from the time when Andrew and his unnamed companion went to Jesus for a two hours' conversation to the day when Thomas exclaimed "My Lord, and my God," and was addressed by the Master as believing. One can almost see the growth of the word in significance as the successive stories are read. Moreover, the same thing is marked, in a very incidental and yet striking way, by the statements which occur with regard to certain things, that the disciples only came to understand and believe after Jesus rose from the dead. What more vivid picture of developing faith, and thus of inmost personal experience, could be given than that which is suggested by this word, which means on each new day more than it did on the day before, and which has its limits during the Lord's earthly life so carefully pointed out, by the declaration that this or that mysterious thing did not become clear to the believing soul until after His earthly life was ended. And finally this word is connected with the author himself, if we hold him to be the companion of Andrew in chap. i. and the one who ran with Peter

to the tomb of Jesus on the morning of the resurrection. Evidently, like Andrew, he was led to believe in the hours of that first interview. Evidently, he is included among the disciples who believed in consequence of the first miracle at Cana. But what progress had been made, when (xx. 8), on entering into the tomb on that Sunday morning, he saw and believed.

3. The same thing is shown by all the indications which prove that the disciple whom Jesus loved, and the one who is alluded to, but not named, in different parts of the book, is the author. It will be unnecessary to enter in this matter at length, for Godet has dwelt upon it largely in his Introduction. But we would give a brief presentation of a few points. The phenomena of the book, in this regard, are the following: first, that, while the other principal characters in the story are mentioned by name, and always thus mentioned, there is a prominent disciple who is only alluded to, or is set before us simply by means of a descriptive phrase; secondly, that, while it is not made so plain as to be beyond the possibility of questioning, that this unnamed person is always one and the same, yet in the doubtful cases, which are only two in number (i. 35 ff., xviii. 15, 16), the probabilities strongly favor the identification of the person referred to with the disciple whom Jesus loved, who is mentioned in all the others. Godet seems to question this in the second case (see p. 30 and note on xviii. 15). But the argument, even in this case, is a strong one: (*w*) The very fact that elsewhere there is but one disciple who takes an active part in any scene, such as this one here takes, and yet is not named, makes the supposition probable, that here also the same person is intended. (*x*) The fact that this "other disciple" (if he was the author of the Gospel) was known to Annas, will easily account for the report of the examination before that dignitary which he gives, while he omits the judicial trial before Caiaphas of which the other Gospels speak. He was an acquaintance of Annas, and so was admitted to his house. But not being on the same terms with Caiaphas, he was not present at the trial.[1] (*y*) The relation of this other disciple to Peter corresponds with that which is set forth elsewhere as existing between Peter and the disciple whom Jesus loved. (*z*) If the disciple whom Jesus loved was the author of the book, and therefore familiar with the scenes of the time and with Peter, it is scarcely possible that he should not have known who this other disciple was, and have given his name (unless, indeed, he was him-

[1] That Annas was the high priest referred to in xviii. 19, and so also in xviii. 15, is altogether probable.

self the person). Or, on the other hand, if the author was of a later time, we may ask whether it is probable that the name of Peter's companion on this occasion could have been forgotten? The story of Peter's denials certainly belonged to the widest circle of tradition, and the whole scene connected with them was a marked and impressive one. The only objection which may be urged on the other side is the omission of the article ὁ before ἄλλος μαθητής. But, in view of the writer's care in concealing the name of this beloved disciple, this omission can scarcely be regarded as having such weight as to overbalance the considerations mentioned. As to the other case (i. 35 ff), the points already alluded to are sufficient to show that the companion of Andrew was the disciple whom Jesus loved. But it may also be remarked that this companion of Andrew stood apparently in the same relation to him and Peter in which John stood, as represented by the other gospels, and that their acquaintance or association before the permanent call to discipleship, which is indicated here, corresponds to that which is hinted at in Mark i. 16–20, i. 29; Lk. iv. 38; v. 1 ff.

But, if the person alluded to in xviii. 15 and i. 35, is the same with the one called the disciple whom Jesus loved, we find the direct statement in xxi. 24, that he is the author—a statement either from himself, or from others who declare that they know his testimony to be true, and who, by reason of the present μαρτυρῶν as distinguished from the aorist γράψας, must have written their postscript, as Godet has pointed out, during his lifetime; we also find the direct declaration of xix. 35 that the author was present at the crucifixion; and we find, once more, bearing to the same end, all those incidental things which mark the narrative of an eye-witness; comp., for example, the story in i. 35 ff., that of the supper in chap. xiii., that of the early part of chap. xviii., etc. With reference to xix. 35, Godet has sufficiently shown the untenableness of the position of those who deny that the author is speaking of himself. But we may add, in a single word, that the introduction of an entirely new person, at this point in the story, with no description except that he saw the scenes, is wholly improbable, and also wholly unlike the author's course elsewhere. As the disciple whom Jesus loved has been mentioned, ten verses earlier, as present at the crucifixion, it is infinitely more probable that he is the person referred to. If he is not so, the writer attempts to give emphasis and force to a statement of the facts mentioned by citing for them a witness utterly unknown to his readers, and then attempts to confirm his testimony—this man whom they knew nothing of—by saying: he knows that he tells the truth. Who is he, is the question of all questions, if his testimony is to

be of any value. But no answer to this question is given. Moreover, this unknown man is declared to know that he says the truth, that *you* (the readers) *also may believe*. Certainly, no intelligent writer would ever write such a sentence, or bring forward such testimony. Let us remember that this book was to meet adversaries and the advocates of other systems, and was to exhibit proofs to them. What would such a proof be worth? If, on the other hand, the "one who hath seen" is the beloved disciple, how far greater the emphasis, and how far more probable the insertion of the verse, in case the author is making a solemn declaration of *his own* knowledge and truthfulness, than if he is simply assuring the readers that that disciple (who was another person than himself and who had lived many years before this writing) knew the truth of what he said. There is but one difficulty in the passage, if he means himself—namely, the use of the third person of the pronoun. This, however, belongs with the other expression: the disciple, etc., which is also in the third person, and is occasioned by his desire to keep himself in a sense concealed. But against the other views of the sentence every difficulty, which the nature of the case allows, arises, and improbability can scarcely reach a higher point than it does as related to them. The verse loses, largely or wholly, its emphasis and its significance, unless the author is the one who makes the declaration. It may be added that the present tenses and the correspondence in thought with the verses expressing the purpose of the book (xx. 30, 31) should not be overlooked—and they give their evidence for the same conclusion.

Testimony and inward experience—testimony originally coming to the writer and his fellow disciples, and their own personal inward experience as they received and believed the testimony; these are the two essential elements of the author's plan. In the light which we gain in connection with them, we may explain the peculiarity of the Prologue. Why does the writer open his book with the word Logos, giving no explanation of its meaning and, after the few introductory verses are ended, making no further allusion to it? The use of this term with no explanation must indicate that it was so familiar to his readers as to be readily understood. The laying it aside at the close of the Prologue suggests that it was only intended to connect the book with inquiries or discussions, which were occupying the minds of thoughtful men in the region where the author was living. If the subject represented by this word was a wholly new one to the original readers, we may safely say that the phenomena of the Prologue could not be what they are. Whatever, therefore, may have been the origin of the term Logos as here used, we may believe that it

was employed in the philosophical disputations of the time—that learned and intelligent men were asking for an answer to their questions which were represented by this term. We may, also, believe that these questions had reference to the possibility and manner of God's revealing Himself to or in the world. The writer found such men considering this great subject and giving what explanations or theories they could. He found them in uncertainty or in darkness, inquiring with no answer or wandering off into the gross errors of which Paul speaks in the Epistle to the Colossians and errors which even passed beyond these. He desired to connect his book with their inquiries and to tell them that he had discovered the answer which they needed. The man with whom he had lived was the Logos. He was the full and final revelation of God. The Logos was in the beginning with God and was God, but had now become incarnate in Jesus Christ. Let me prove this to you, he says, as it were. But let me accomplish this end, not as I might do by setting before you a mere collection of evidences or arguments, which have no immediate personal connection with myself, and none even with Him as a part of the daily life which He led among men. Let me do it, rather, by giving you the picture of the living man as He walked with His contemporaries, and especially with his earliest followers, along the pathway of His earthly career. In this way I can place Him before you as He was, and you can see the evidences as they were given by Himself. You can live with Him, as it were, and hear Him speak of the heavenly things. To these readers the term Logos may have come from the Jewish-Alexandrian philosophy, while to him it came directly from the Old Testament. To him it may have had a different meaning, in some degree, from that which it had for them, and a far deeper one. But it served, nevertheless, as a connecting-link between his answer and their questionings, and having made it useful to this end, he leads them away from fruitless discussion to the contemplation of Jesus as he had known Him. At the same time, his book would have its adaptation to every chance reader, in whose way it might fall, and would call his mind, if possible, through the testimony and the experience to the life.

If we explain the Gospel in this way, everything becomes plain, and the book comes forth, as its rich, deep thoughts would indicate, from the depths of a meditative soul in personal union with Christ when He was on earth. But if we locate the writer in the second century, what must we believe? We must believe that out of a few notes made by the Apostle John, or, apart from anything of his, out of the Synoptic narratives,

the writer manufactured a history of Jesus' life which he represented as moving along with his disciples and gradually influencing their characters and their living. Yes, even more than this; that he did this so successfully, so far as relates to the person of the disciple whom Jesus loved, that the great majority of the Church in all ages have believed the author to be that disciple. To accomplish such a result, a century after the history was ended, would require an imagination of a high order, a power of transferring oneself to the life of a remote past period such as even men of genius rarely have. Such a power belongs only to the higher order of poets or writers of fiction. But this author, whoever he may have been, did not possess this faculty. We may not know his name, but the peculiar characteristics of his mind and soul are exhibited so clearly in his writings, that he stands before us with distinctness and with individuality. He was no writer of fiction or poet of the order mentioned. He was a man who, beyond any other in the New Testament history, or, indeed, almost any other of any age, dwelt within himself, in the region of contemplation, and that not the contemplation of intellectual themes, but of the growth of the soul's life. Introvertive, meditating upon himself and his own character, thinking deep thoughts only as they took hold upon the relation of his soul to God and brought the inward man into the light, picturing to himself the glory of heaven only as that likeness to God which should come from seeing Him as He is—such a man would be the last of all to transfer his experience to the life of another, or either to desire or be able to picture another as himself. To such a man, the inward life is too precious and too personal to be represented as if it were not his own. It is too intensely individual to pass beyond the one to whom it belongs as the central thing of his being.

We may add, that it would have been no easy thing for any man, as near even to the life of Jesus as Paul or Apollos were—and surely not for one living in the second century—to represent his own Christian life as if it had grown up in a personal association with Him when He was on earth. The sorry failures of all attempts, in our day even, to give a life-like picture of those apostolic scenes may show us how hard a task it must have always been to do such a work successfully. But, in some respects, it must have been more difficult for the early Christians to do it, for the dividing line between the apostles and themselves, as those who had seen the Lord and those who had not, was a broad one and one of which they never lost sight. But here is a success which has deceived the ages, and a success accomplished by a man who had great thoughts, yet

not at all the genius of fiction—who lived in his friendship with the Lord, but could not have pictured it to himself or others as growing up under different conditions from those which actually belonged to it.

We venture, also, to maintain that *the motive* of a speculative or theological character, which has led some to believe that the story is told by the author as if he were the apostle when he was not, did not exist. The evidences as to the mental character of the writer of the Gospel, which we find in his works, are not that he was a speculative philosopher, that he dwelt upon propositions or truths for their own sake, that he was ready to construct a theological system for the purpose of teaching it, or to introduce new theories into the Church. His thoughts relate only to character and life. He cares nothing for them except as they enrich the soul. He even writes his story of Jesus for the purpose of proving His Divine nature and work, only because he is assured that belief in the truth will bring life eternal to the believer. And these thoughts which grow into character are, first of all, interesting to him for the reason that they take hold of and beautify his own character.

If we examine the First Epistle in connection with the Gospel, we find what these thoughts were, and where the writer first received them into his mind. The great truth is that God is light, and in Him is no darkness at all. This absolute and perfect spiritual light, is what the human soul, according to the measure of its capacity, must participate in, if it is to have its highest life. The life of the soul is light. Comp. 1 Ep. i. 5, Gosp. i. 4. How is this life to be secured? This is the question with which his mind is wholly occupied. How shall it be secured by himself and by all other men? The day which brought him into communication with Jesus Christ answered the question. The years and the meditations which followed from that first meeting to his latest age, only made the answer more full and more satisfying. Thought, therefore, moves along this line. The relation of the personal Jesus, full of grace and truth, to his individual soul is the starting-point of all thinking, and the nature of Jesus, His work, and everything respecting Him centre, in their all-absorbing interest, around this relation. Friendship with Jesus was the atmosphere in which he lived. The meditations of friendship and the study, in experience, of its power to develop the inward man—not the speculations of philosophy or theology—were what occupied his life. Hence we find him, when he comes to write for the world, telling first, in the Gospel, the simple story of what Jesus did and said, and afterwards, in the Epistle, saying at the outset, "That which we have heard, seen, handled of the

Word of life, which was with the Father and was manifested unto us, declare we unto you." The end in view, in the latter case, is also the same as in the former: "that you (the readers) may have fellowship with us whose fellowship is with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ."

No writer in the New Testament was more unfitted by the peculiar characteristics of his nature to find interest in creating a history for the purpose of developing an idea. No class of thinking men in any age turn with less readiness to mere speculations for their own sake than those who, like this writer, are ever studying with intense delight the progress of their own souls in true living. Let us try to imagine a speculative philosopher, of earlier or later times, coming before his readers with a manufactured history, told in the simple style of the Gospel, and then saying: That which I have heard and seen and handled I declare to you, that you may have fellowship with me in God and Christ, and these things I write that my joy may be fulfilled. The inmost nature of the two classes of men is different. The author of the fourth Gospel was not a philosopher of the schools, nor a contemplative mystic. He lived in the experience and recollections of a personal friendship and found in that friendship the eternal life. He could not have created the story of his life with Jesus by his imagination, if he would, for his nature was such that it must rest on reality. The deepest souls, of his peculiar order, as we have already said, do not and cannot picture their own experience as that of another; much less, if possible, can they make a fictitious narrative contradicting the supremest facts of their personal life, for the purpose of impressively presenting to the world a theological idea.

Among the personages of the apostolic history who live and move before us on the pages of the New Testament, the writer of this Gospel takes his place as truly as any other. Paul and Peter, even, do not stand forth as living characters more clearly than he does. He comes forward, indeed, as if in his bodily presence, in several of the narratives, and by reason of the familiar acquaintance which he shows with the details of the history and with the geography, the customs, the men of the region which he describes. But with far greater distinctness even, does he appear to us in his character and inward personality. The testimony of thousands of men who have communed with him in spirit, as they have given themselves up to the contemplation of his deep thoughts, bears witness as to what he was, and their testimony, in all the ages, is the same. The book which he has written gives evidence with regard to him as truly and as fully as the Pauline Epistles do for their author. It shows as plainly

that he was one of apostolic company who attended Jesus in the years of His ministry, as the writings of the apostle to the Gentiles prove that he was not.

The external testimonies for the authenticity of the Gospel, as Godet and many other writers have shown, are exceedingly strong. That of Irenæus, given so abundantly, is in itself sufficient, for he knew Polycarp, who had known John. But we are persuaded that the book carries *within itself* its strongest evidence. And this evidence is inwoven into its whole texture, and is the more powerful in its impressiveness because it is so incidental and undesigned. We have given a few suggestions with regard to it, which may, in a measure, supplement what Godet has presented in his excellent introduction. The subject might be set forth with much greater detail and with more of completeness in the plan of presentation. But in the limited space allowed us, we have desired only to move along one line of thought, and have been able, even in this line, to do no more than indicate what may open a wide field of study for the thoughtful reader of this Gospel. Before concluding these introductory remarks upon the book, however, we will call attention to two or three scenes in the story related by the author, in which the reality of a past experience is what gives them all their life and power. The scene recorded in i. 35 ff. is one of these. Of this we have already spoken. But it is by no means the only one. In the narrative of the last evening of the life of Jesus, the author represents Him as comforting the hearts of the disciples in view of His approaching death by the promise of a future reunion in heaven. He begins by assuring them that there are many mansions in His Father's house, and adds the declaration that He is going to prepare a place for them there. But between the two statements there is a word inserted, which has been to many difficult of explanation: "If it were not so, I would have told you." Whence does the force of this expression come? Where does it get its significance? Surely, from the past life with the disciples, and from that alone. As spoken by a stranger, or by another than a friend, the words would have had little or no meaning. But as taking hold upon every day of those three years of their life together, as recalling all that He had been to them and done for them, as opening the depths of His love and friendship so wonderfully revealed to their inmost experience, they became the strongest testimony to the truth of what He said at the parting hour. Your experience in the past may bear witness that I would not deceive you—may prove to you that there is a place for you in the Father's house, for, if it were not so, I would not have failed to tell

you. But they are of that peculiar character which makes it improbable, almost to the extent of impossibility, that a writer of another generation would have dreamed of inserting them. To the soul of the beloved disciple they would be a precious memory for a lifetime, a word of love to be often recalled with tenderest recollection. They speak of living friendship and appeal to a past. But the one to whom they spoke thus must have known the past and have shared in the living friendship. Stories created for the presentation of a theological idea do not move in the sphere of such expressions. The Christian author of the third or fourth generation of believers might, perhaps, have put into the mouth of Jesus the promise that He would prepare a place for His followers, or the assurance that there was room for them in Heaven, but this little sentence would never have found place in his thought or his narrative. It belongs to the evening on which it is said to have been uttered and to the experience of one who heard it from the Lord Himself. It testifies of the authorship of the book by an ear-witness.

Or again, in the same scene of the last evening, who but one who was present and witnessed the changing thoughts of successive moments could have recorded those words of xvi. 5, 6: "But now I go unto him that sent me; and none of you asketh me whither goest thou," after having related in the earlier part of the conversation, that one of the disciples had suggested this very question, xiv. 5? To one, however, who remembered the scene as himself participating in it, these words had a living freshness and recalled the grief and disappointment of their hopes, which so filled the hearts of all that they thought only of their own future, and not of the blessedness which should come to Jesus. How completely does this place us in the midst of the apostolic company and tell us of the living experience of the hour. It is not the effort of the advocate of some intellectual conception or theory that we find here, but the thought of a loving friend who always bore with him, even to his latest life, what he had felt and what Jesus had said in one of the supreme moments of the past.

Or, if we look at the story of the morning of the resurrection, the striking way in which the faith of the disciple whom Jesus loved is represented as confirmed by what he saw in the tomb, while that of Peter is not spoken of, points to such knowledge of the inner history of the former as indicates that the writer was referring to himself. The same is true of the life-like picture presented before us in the twenty-first chapter. Not only is it wholly improbable that a writer, who had

never stood at the standpoint of the event related, and who was writing after the death of the beloved disciple, would have taken this method of correcting the error alluded to; but the story, by its inimitable naturalness as answering to the feeling of the two participants in the last part of the scene with Jesus, carries us into the heart of the writer as he remembers all that happened.

Or, finally—to refer only to one more passage—how are we to account for the touching incident in xix. 25–27, where Jesus entrusts his mother to the care of the beloved disciple? She had children of her own who could care for her, or, if not children, nephews who were to her as if sons. Why does not Jesus commit her to their care? The fact that they were unbelievers at the time will not explain this peculiar act, for they were to become believers within a few days after the death of Jesus (comp. Acts i. 14), and He must have foreseen this. The only answer to the question which the verses suggest is that, at the final hour, Jesus rose above the power of earthly relationships, and, in view of His separation from them both, joined the two friends, to whom He was most closely bound in affection, as son and mother. But, if this was the reason of His giving the one of the two to the other, the act bears within itself the result of a long-continued and real life of the soul in all the three as related to one another. It is wholly dependent on a living experience. And whose experience is to be found in the unnamed sharer in this scene? Is it the originator of a system, the defender of an idea, the meditative philosopher, who brings into a fictitious narrative a little incident like this, which could have no interest as compared with many things that might have directly emphasized his doctrine of the Logos? Is it not, on the other hand, the man who, in the later years of his life, goes over once more the facts of his own association with his Master and finds in them all the power of a holy friendship for his own soul?

All these things—if any judgment of what is true can be formed in the case of any man's utterance or writing—testify of reality. They depend on the reality of that which is related for their significance. And the only satisfactory explanation of their appearance in the book is that the author was bearing witness of what he had seen and heard. The supposition that such stories were told for the purpose of maintaining a theory or of glorifying one of the apostles at the expense of another is little less than absurd. They are not fitted in any considerable measure for either purpose. They take hold upon the tenderest feelings of the heart, and are foreign to the sphere of rivalry or discussion. And the fact that

their full meaning is to be sought and found only beneath the surface adds to the evidence that the writer and the apostle of whom he wrote were one and the same person.

It is often said that the student of the Bible must be in sympathy with it, if he would reach the deepest understanding of what it is and what it teaches. This is no doubt true, for the unsympathetic mind never reaches the perfect light in any line of study. But, in a peculiar sense, it is necessary for one who comes to the investigation of the fourth Gospel, that he should have some comprehension of the inner life of a Christian believer who grows into the likeness of Christ by personal communion with Him —who abides within the region of his own spirit, and moves upward and onward in the sphere of a divine friendship. It is not enough to dissect the sentences, or consider the theological doctrine, or attempt to fit the narrative to an idea, or trace the possible development of thought under certain influences on the foundation of the Synoptic story. The man himself who wrote the book must be understood, for he is, after all, in his own inner life, the greatest factor in it. The student of his writings must see him himself. He must be in sympathy with him, if he would be prepared to appreciate the evidence which he has furnished as to his personality. It is the want of this sympathy, arising from the want of that peculiar belief which gave him his truest life, that has placed many writers on his Gospel quite outside of its central and inmost part. They have dissected the book, but they have not known the man.

But when we know the man, we comprehend the book—and we recognize in the book not a poem or a work of fiction; the author did not live in the region of the imagination:—not the writing of one who created a doctrine or system for himself by means of his own reflection; his musings were of a far different order from this:—not the effort of a man who tries to save Christianity from the influence of Judaism, or to reconcile parties and unify the Church, or to elevate or depreciate one or another of the apostolic company; he is neither a partisan nor a professed peacemaker:— but the simple story of what a man of the richest inward life, who had lived with Jesus, learned of His nature and His wonderful spiritual power, both in his association with Him and in the meditations of the years that followed.

The Christian system is not dependent on the genuineness of the fourth Gospel, so that, if the latter could be disproved, the former would fail. But there is no doubt that the author of this Gospel penetrated in his thought into the centre of the Christian system, as it has been understood

by the Church. The question of the authorship becomes, therefore, one of gravest importance. If the author was that most intimate disciple of Jesus of whom the book speaks so frequently, he gained his conception of Christ and the new faith from the Lord Himself, and he could not be mistaken. His book is the flower and consummation of the apostolic thought. It is in the truest and highest sense inspired of God. The attempt to deny the system is a hopeless one, so soon as this Gospel is established on a firm foundation. In view of this fact, it may well seem divinely ordered that the book should stand in the world as it has ever done, bearing within itself its own evidence. The writer of it, in addressing the readers for whom his first Epistle was intended, says that he writes that which he has seen and heard, in order that they may have fellowship, as he himself has, with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ. It is a wonderful fact in the history of the centuries which have passed since he wrote, that those who have been persuaded by his story to believe and who have been conscious, as the result of their faith, that they had fellowship with God, have had an abiding confidence that he told of what he had heard and seen, and that it is those who have rejected the doctrine and the peculiar life, who have questioned the reality of the author's experience as the disciple whom Jesus loved. The past may give us confidence in the future; and we may safely predict that, until the inner life of the author ceases to bear this witness, he and his Gospel will be among the unshaken pillars of the Church.

ADDITIONAL NOTES BY THE AMERICAN EDITOR.

I.

Chapter I.

The leading thoughts respecting the Logos which are presented in the Prologue are those of ver. 1 and ver. 14. The former verse sets forth what He was antecedent to the time of His incarnation, and in the beginning; the latter declares that He became flesh.

A. With reference to the first verse the following points may be noticed:—1. The object of the whole Prologue being to make certain declarations respecting the Logos, there can be no doubt that ὁ λόγος is the subject in all the three clauses of which the verse is composed—in the third, no less than in the other two. This is indicated also by the parallelism, with slight variation, which seems to belong to the rhetorical style of this author. The clauses are parallel, but the predicate stands first in two of them, while in the intermediate one the subject has its natural position. 2. In the third clause, the predicate θεός, being different from that in the second, ὁ θεός, must be intended to suggest to the reader a different idea. This different idea, however, being expressed by the same substantive, cannot reasonably be held to be of an entirely different order. The word without the article must move in the same sphere with that which has it. The Logos, according to the statement of the writer, must be *God* in a similar sense to that in which the one *with whom He is* is God, and yet not in precisely the same sense. So far as the book may properly be regarded as an unfolding, in any degree, of the thoughts of the Prologue, we may naturally expect to find in the chapters which follow, the answer to the question thus presented: in what sense are the words to be understood, when it is said that the Logos is θεός and not ὁ θεός? 3. In the verses (2–4), which are immediately connected with ver. 1, the last of the three clauses of that verse does not appear, but the other two are repeated. The explanation of this fact is, doubtless, to be found in the purpose of these verses. The author is moving, in these verses, along the line of revelation. This line is presented in the three terms: creation, life and light. The Logos was the instrumental agent through whom all created things were brought into being. To that portion of creation which is animate or rational, as contrasted with the inanimate or irrational part, He is the life-principle, which gives it life. To that part which has the higher element, the πνεῦμα, and thus has the capacity for the action of the life-principle in the higher region, He is the light. What the idea of light is may best be understood by the use of the word in 1 John i. 5, where it is said that God is light, and

it is added, with the same contrast of φῶς and σκοτία which we have here, that in Him is no darkness at all. The divine Spiritual illumination for man comes in and through the Logos. 4. As the world of beings capable of receiving spiritual light failed, by reason of their moral darkness, to see and take to themselves the enlightening revelation, which the Logos was ever making to all even from the hour of creation, some clearer mode of making the light known to them was necessary, and for this purpose the Logos became incarnate (ver. 14). 5. The person in whom He became incarnate is Jesus Christ, ver. 17.—Such is the development of the thought connected with the Logos as the revealer of God. The Logos was in the beginning with God. Thus He is the one by means of whom God gives the true light to men. That they may have it as fully as is needful in order to their possessing it in the soul's life, He enters into a human mode of existence and appears in Jesus. The first and second clauses of ver. 1, repeated in ver. 2, are the starting-point of this development, and are all that are essential to its beginning. 6. It cannot be doubted, however, that the statement of the third clause, which is added to the other two, and which must have a deeper meaning than the others because it declares *what* the Logos was, while they only, as it were, tell *where* and *when* He was, is intended by the writer to hold even a more prominent place than they. They are repeated, and the thought for which they open the way is unfolded, because the discussions and questionings which occasioned the writing of the book required the idea of revealing God to be presented. But that this revelation of which the book is to speak is and must be the true one, the only true one, is a point of greatest importance to the end which the author has in view. For thus only can it exclude every other and become the undoubted answer to the question which all were raising. To the completeness of His power to reveal, He must be, not only πρὸς τὸν θεόν, but θεός. Since He is θεός, He must, in some sense, become ἄνθρωπος in order that the revelation may be perfectly apprehended by men. He must be the θεὸς ἄνθρωπος. In this view of the author's thought, the third clause of ver. 1 unites itself with the suggestion of ver. 14, and then these two leading ideas pass on to ver. 17; and, joining that verse with themselves, they find their full expression in the words: Jesus Christ is the θεὸς-ἄνθρωπος. Hence it is, as we may believe, that the Prologue closes with the last statement of the 18th verse: The only-begotten Son (or—if that be the true reading—God only begotten) who is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him. 7. While, therefore, in one view of the Prologue and the whole Gospel, this final proposition of ver. 1 may hold only a secondary place in the plan, or even, perhaps, be unessential to it, in another and a most important sense, these words are the primary words of the entire book, to which everything else is subordinate. That he may prove that Jesus is the Son of God, and thus that that life which is the living of the human soul in the light of God, having in it no darkness at all, may be realized by every reader through faith in Him, is the object and purpose of his writing his story of Jesus. 8. It is on this third clause, not on the first two only, that the expressions

in the Gospel which have the deepest meaning rest. As being θεός and in the bosom of the Father, He has life in Himself, even as the Father has life in Himself; He is the living bread and the life-giving bread; He and His Father are one; to know Him is to know God and to have the eternal life of the soul. This deepest meaning must be gathered from all the words of the book which have any teaching in them with reference to it, and they must all be centered in this word θεός, if we are in any true sense to comprehend its significance.

B. With respect to ver. 14, it may be said: 1. That the word σάρξ must be interpreted in connection, not only with its use in the writings of this author, and, as would also seem probable, with that of the other authors of the New Testament, but with the words or clauses in the context which evidently belong in the same circle of thought. The Logos, as He became flesh, is said to have tabernacled among us; to have been beheld by the writer and others; to have imparted from His own fullness that grace which came through Jesus Christ; apparently, in some true conception of the words, to have become Jesus Christ (see ver. 17 in its relation to ver. 14 and ver. 16, on the one hand, and to ver. 18 on the other). Σάρξ must, therefore, in some sense, be the equivalent of ἄνθρωπος; and, as in the case of θεός of ver. 1, already alluded to, every indication which the book presents before us points to the end that we should make our attempt to determine in what sense it is thus equivalent, by means of the representation given in subsequent chapters respecting Jesus.—The term Logos is laid aside by the author immediately at the close of the Prologue, but we cannot fail to see that he never loses sight of the two statements as to what the Logos was and became. Jesus—the friend and master of whom he writes—is not merely a messenger of God to the world to bring to it a revelation, but he is the one in whom the Logos, who was θεός, has become ἄνθρωπος, the one who is able perfectly to reveal because of the θεός side or relation of His being, and to make His revelation understood by those around Him because of the ἄνθρωπος side or relation. Thus, and thus only, is He the true light of the world, bringing it into the actual experience of the eternal life.

II.

In what relation to the leading ideas of the Prologue do the statements respecting grace and truth stand? The answer to this question may be sought in connection with ver. 17 and the contrast with the law which is there presented. It will be noticed that these words are first introduced at the end of ver. 14, that immediately after them follows the second reference to the testimony of John the Baptist, and that then they are taken up again as if for further explanation. From these peculiar characteristics of the passage, it would seem not improbable that the writer was thinking of John the Baptist, who, as the last of the prophets, was also, in a certain sense, the one who brought the Old Testament legal system to its end, and, by turning the minds of the people to the right-

eousness which the true idea of the law required, as opposed to that which its Pharisaic expounders preached, prepared them for the new system which was about to be introduced. The office of John the Baptist, as he proclaimed the advent of the Messiah, was to set forth the necessity of a radical change of character (*μετάνοια*), to make known with a new power and impressiveness the vital importance of being, not merely externally, but internally right, to demand on behalf of the kingdom of God a new life. Repentance and reformation were the burden of his message. This message, as we may say, was the final word of the legal system, as it passed away and opened the door for the faith-system. The work of Jesus was to make this reformation and new life possible, through the proclamation of the fullness of Divine truth, the revealing and imparting of Divine grace, the teaching of the way of salvation through forgiveness and that righteousness which grows up in the pardoned soul by means of faith. This revelation made by Jesus Christ was that which justifies the expression used in ver. 18. The law, even in its spiritual application to the inner life, might be revealed through a man, like Moses or John the Baptist. But, in order to reveal the fullness of God's grace and truth, the appearance of a greater than man was needed. To this end one must have seen God, in the highest sense of that word—as *no man* has ever seen Him. The only-begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father, the Logos who was with God in the beginning and was God, and who, by becoming flesh, brings God into closest communion with men, can alone make this revelation.

III.

Why is the testimony of John the Baptist referred to and made so prominent in the Prologue? We find it alluded to not only after the verse (14) in which the incarnation is set forth, but even in ver. 5 f. immediately following the statements respecting the Logos in His pre-existent state. The distinct presentation of its contents, however, is evidently deferred until the beginning of the historical introduction (ver. 19 ff.). The true explanation of this peculiar fact may, not improbably, be suggested by the plan of the book, as already indicated in the Introductory Remarks on the internal evidence for the fourth Gospel. As the earliest disciples, according to the representation of the book, were brought to Jesus by the testimony of John the Baptist, and the object of the book is to induce the readers to believe on the same grounds on which these disciples believed, it was natural to give a peculiar prominence to John's testimony at the beginning. His testimony was, in a certain sense, the foundation of all that followed, and hence it was not unsuitable—it was, on the other hand, especially impressive—to place it in connection with the great fundamental propositions which were designed to arrest the attention of those for whom the book was primarily written. That the testimony of John is regarded by the author as having a very prominent place, in its direct bearing upon Jesus' position and His relation to God,

is shown by the reference to it in v. 33, 34. In the author's selection, in that chapter, of the expressions of Jesus which set forth the evidence for His claims respecting Himself, he chooses for his narrative this one which points to John. And though Jesus in the surrounding words declares that He has a higher and greater testimony, the witness of John is pressed upon the thought of the hearers.

John's testimony, as it is introduced in ver. 6 f., has immediate reference to the Logos as the light, and thus to the last point in the statements of vv. 1–4. We may believe, however, that, though not directly, yet in an indirect way, it is mentioned in just this place in order to carry the mind of the reader back to the first great propositions of ver. 1, which lie at the foundation of the declaration that He is the light.

The second mention of John's testimony (after ver. 14) evidently bears upon that verse. As it includes the words "He was before me," and as these words are even the ones which have special emphasis, so far at least as relates to the depth of the meaning of the sentence, the suggestion just made with regard to the previous allusion, in ver. 6 ff., may also be applicable here. That John the Baptist comprehended fully, when He bore witness to Jesus, all that John the Apostle knew of His Divine nature, we need not affirm. But that the witness which he gave was a significant element in the proof that Jesus Christ is the Logos, of whom what is said in ver. 1 and what is said in ver. 14 are both true, we alike believe; and this is the reason for including what John had testified in the Prologue.

IV.

The reference of ver. 5, by reason of the position which the verse holds—in immediate connection with vv. 1–4 and before the allusion to the testimony of John—is probably to the general and permanent illuminating power of the light before the incarnation. The Logos was with God and was God; as being thus, He was the source of existence to the creation, of life to creatures endowed with life, of light to those having the spiritual faculty. So far vv. 1–4. It is now declared that this light permanently shines—from the beginning ever onward—but that the darkness did not apprehend it in the earlier times, and hence the necessity is suggested of a clearer shining or revelation (that of ver. 14). The past tense of the verb *apprehended* seems to show that the permanent present (which would hold true of all time) is limited, so far as the thought of this verse is concerned, to the time indicated by its associate verb. We may hold, therefore, with reasonable confidence, that the entire passage vv. 1–5 has reference to the Logos before His incarnation, as vv. 14–16 relate to Him as incarnate.

But what shall we say of vv. 6–13? The intermediate position of this passage suggests a pointing in both directions. The antecedent probabilities, also, as to what the writer would do in moving from ver. 5 to ver. 14 indicate the same thing. Finally, the proper interpretation of different individual verses in the passage may, not improbably, confirm us in the

conclusion. Certainly, ver. 11 must be taken as referring to the period following the incarnation, as of course the actual witness-bearing of John must be located in this period. But ver. 9, by reason of the emphatic ἦν and also by reason of the correspondence in the permanent present φωτίζει of this verse with φαίνει of ver. 5, is most naturally interpreted as preceding the ἐγένετο of ver. 14. There seems, also, to be a natural progress in vv. 10–12, of such a nature that, within the sphere of the general present φωτίζει, ver. 10 points to what was before the earthly appearance of the Logos, and vv. 11, 12 point to what followed after that appearance. John *was* not the light, but He *came* to *testify* of it. The true light *was* always—in the early ages, bearing witness for itself and shining through and in the creation, physical and spiritual, which He had brought into existence; and in the later time, through His manifestation of Himself as a man of the Jewish race. In both periods alike, however, the darkness in which men were, because of evil, prevented His being known and received. The presence of faith was needed in order to the receptivity of the soul for the light, and that it might be secured, so far as to bring men to look to Jesus as the revealer of God in the highest sense, John the Baptist had appeared as a divinely-appointed witness-bearer. He came, that all might believe through him.

V.

Following upon this intermediate passage, which has thus a progressive movement from the pre-existent to the incarnate period, the second great idea of the entire Prologue is distinctly stated, in a proposition standing in a parallelism with those in ver. 1. The Word became flesh. The Logos entered into human life. The light which had previously been shining in creation and, in some sense, in the soul of every man, but which had not been apprehended, is now revealed in the clearest possible manner by means of the indwelling of the Logos in a man, and by thus bringing God and man into immediate communication. The word *light* now passes away, but it gives place to the expressions: We beheld His glory; full of grace and truth. The idea is therefore preserved, though the mode of presenting it changes. The change, however, is in sympathy with the advance movement of the thought. The revelation of the Logos is now so perfect that those who see it behold His glory. The darkness has passed, and He is looked upon face to face. And, moreover, the revelation is of grace and truth—it is of that deepest part of God's nature which He alone who was with Him in the beginning, and who is in His bosom as the Son with the Father, can make known. The light thus shines from the beginning to the end, only more clearly at last than at first. It is apprehended, as it shines, by the souls that are susceptible to it. But the susceptibility comes always through faith, and only through faith. And at the end the believers behold, with undimmed vision, the glory of the light. To this more glorious manifestation John the Baptist bears testimony, and, pointing to the man in whom the Logos is revealed, he says "He that cometh after me is become before me, for He was before me." This man is Jesus Christ.

VI.

If this view of the Prologue, which has been set forth in the preceding notes, is correct, the plan of the author, so far from presenting serious difficulties, becomes a thoroughly artistic one—the different lines of thought being most carefully interwoven with one another; the progress is plain, not only from ver. 1 to ver. 14, but from ver. 1 to ver. 4 and ver. 5, from ver. 6 to ver. 13, from vv. 6–13 to ver. 14, and from ver. 14 to what follows; and finally the insertion of the testimony of John is accounted for in a way which most naturally and satisfactorily explains what seems, at first sight, so peculiar, and yet in a way which shows that it, in no proper sense, breaks the line of development of the ideas of light and revelation.

With reference to the individual words and phrases of the Prologue the following points may be briefly noticed: 1. The idea of the author in connection with several of the leading words is, undoubtedly, to be discovered from the main portion of the Gospel, rather than from the introductory passage alone. We may infer, however, from the statements of the Prologue itself, and from the origin of some of them, or their use elsewhere, what their significance as here employed is. This is true of λόγος, ἐν ἀρχῇ, ζωή, φῶς, σάρξ, etc. 2. That the word λόγος was derived from the Old Testament —a growth of the idea which is indicated even in the first chapter of Genesis, and which is developed gradually, as Godet shows, in the later times— is very widely admitted by the best scholars. That it was suggested to the writer, partly, if not wholly, by its use in the discussions of the time and region in which he wrote, seems altogether probable. In any case, the idea fundamental to it is that of God as revealing Himself. The Logos is the one through whom (or that by means of which), God is revealed. Introduced, as it is, as connected with the discussions alluded to and for the purpose of answering the question which was the central one in them, it is natural that its precise meaning should be left for the reader to determine from the propositions of which it is made the subject, and from the story of the one who is declared to be the Logos. Of these propositions, the first two which appear in ver. 1, affirm, in the first place, that the Logos was *in the beginning*—which, from the relation of the words to ver. 3, must, at least, mean that He existed before the creation, so that all things created have their origin through Him; and secondly, that He was *with God*—which expression is further explained by the words of ver. 18: *who is in the bosom of the Father.* They show that the revealing one existed antecedently to all revelation of God in or to the world, and that what He reveals comes from the inmost heart and being of God. But the third proposition goes beyond these, and declares that He was θεός. Of this word it may be said: (*a*) That it is not used elsewhere in this Gospel or in the other writings of this author, or indeed in any case in the New Testament, which can be compared with this, to indicate a being inferior to God; (*b*) That the absence of the article does not indicate any such inferiority, because, in the first place, as the writer desired to throw especial emphasis on this

predicate by placing it at the beginning of the clause, it became necessary to omit it in order that the reader might not, by any means, misapprehend the meaning, and in the second place, because he evidently did not mean to say that the Logos was God in precisely the same sense in which that word is used in the phrase: *He was with God.* He was not the one with whom He was. He was θεός, but not, as the term is here used, ὁ θεός. If he desired to express what in theological language is set forth in such a sentence as: He was of the essence of God, but not the same person with the Father, and if he desired to do this by the use of the word θεός, there would seem to have been no more simple or better way of formulating his thought than by saying: He was πρὸς τὸν θεόν, and was θεός. But it is the declarations of Jesus Himself, and His miraculous signs which are given in the following chapters, which are intended by the writer to determine the full significance of both of these sentences. 3. It is worthy of notice that, while the word Logos disappears, so far as this special use of it is concerned, as soon as the Prologue reaches its end, the words ζωή and φῶς occur many times in the subsequent chapters. These words also draw closely together and intermingle with one another, as it were, in their idea. This fact, which at the first glance seems remarkable, is easy of explanation when the plan and purpose of the book are understood. To prove that Jesus is the *Logos*, in the mere sense that He answers to that which was a matter of philosophical inquiry to those around him, is a thing of little consequence to the writer. But that, as being the true Logos, He is the revealer and source of life and light, is the message which He has to give to the world, the εὐαγγέλιον of God. The satisfying of philosophical questioning is nothing to his view, we may say; the bringing of the human soul into union with God is everything. The close connection of the ideas of life and light is also very natural, for, as we learn from the author's first epistle, the life of God represents itself to him under the figure of light—that pure and perfect light which has no intermingling of darkness—and the ζωή or ζωὴ αἰώνιος of man is the participation in this same light-life. These words, accordingly, are not merely terms of philosophy and, as such, appropriate only to the Prologue, but living expressions of experience. The life is that of the soul illuminated by pure spiritual light. Its atmosphere in which it lives is light. The form of expression in the closing sentences of the Gospel (xx. 30, 31) is thus explained—where the term *Son of God* takes the place of Logos, but the term *life* remains. So also in the First Epistle i. 2, we have the words, "And the life was manifested . . . the eternal life which was with the Father." The word *life* in ver. 4, occurring as it does in the progressive development of thought from ver. 1 to ver. 5, probably has a more general meaning. But in its use afterwards it moves into the sphere of the spiritual, which is the only sphere in which the writer would have his own and his readers' minds abide. 4. That the verb κατέλαβεν of ver. 5 means *apprehended*, and not *overcame*, is rendered probable by the following considerations: (*a*) The former meaning lies nearer to the fundamental signification of the word *to lay hold of, seize upon.* The thought here moves in the spiritual region,

and to lay hold of spiritually is to apprehend. (*b*) The other explanation of the word would indicate that the darkness is here looked upon as a hostile power contending with the light for the mastery. This is the sense perhaps in xii. 35, where darkness is viewed as seizing upon the man, as a power hostile to him. But such a conception does not seem to be in the writer's mind in this passage. The whole movement of thought is in the line of the revelation of God, which needs to become clearer because it had not before been laid hold of. The darkness is not a hostile force struggling with the light, but a blinding power for the human mind, preventing it from seeing the light. This verse corresponds, in this regard, with ver. 10, " the world knew him not." (*c*) The prevailing sense of σκοτία as used by John is that of darkness as preventing men from seeing the light, rather than that of a hostile power contending with the light; comp. the First Epistle i. 6, ii. 9, 11, Gosp. viii. 12. Indeed, the use of the word in xii. 35a seems only a sort of passing figure, for in xii. 35b the common meaning returns: " he that walketh in the darkness knoweth not whither he goeth." 5. The construction of ἐρχόμενον in ver. 9 is quite uncertain. The following considerations favor the connection of the word with πάντα ἄνθρωπον :—(*a*) The position which it has in the sentence points to its union as an adjective-word with this noun. (*b*) This connection gives to this verse its most natural meaning, as descriptive of the permanent work of the light in all ages—the following verses dividing this work with reference to the time before and the time after the incarnation. (*c*) The emphatic position of ἦν at the beginning of the sentence is better accounted for if it is an independent verb; John *was* not the light, yet the light *was*. (*d*) If the author's intention had been to connect the participle with ἦν, the form of the sentence would probably have been different. If his idea was *was coming* as equivalent to *came*, no satisfactory reason can be given for his not using the word *came*. If it was *was about to come*, some more clear expression of the idea and one less liable to misapprehension would have been chosen. In either case, the participle, as we may believe, would have been placed nearer to the verb. On the other hand, the principal objection to connecting the participle with ἄνθρωπον does not seem to be well-founded. This objection, which urges that the expression *every man coming into the world* is the same in meaning with *every man*, and therefore the participle is superfluous, might be of force as bearing against such a phrase in a book of the present day. But such modes of expression belong to the simple, primitive style of the narrative writers of the Bible and have a sort of emphasis peculiar to that style. Moreover, it is not necessary to regard the two expressions as equivalent to each other, for the participle may convey the idea: *as he was coming*, or, *on his coming*. 6. In ver. 14, the words *full of grace and truth* are to be connected with the subject of the main proposition, *the Logos*. The intervening words, *and we beheld his glory*, etc., are thus to be taken, as by R. V. and many commentators, including Godet, as a parenthesis. This is rendered probable not only by the fact that the adjective πλήρης is in the nominative case, but also by the evident immediate connection of the similar words in vv. 16,

17 with the Logos and Jesus Christ. The 15th verse, again, is with relation to the idea expressed by these words, a parenthetical passage, so that the thought moves directly on from ver. 14 to ver. 16. In relation to the matter of testimony, however, ver. 15 is parallel with ver. 6f., and has a similar emphasis and importance. 7. There is apparently somewhat of the same carefulness and accuracy of expression, within the limits of popular language, in the use of *σάρξ*, which we have noticed in the use of *θεός* as distinguished from *ὁ θεός* in ver. 1. The writer did not wish to say that the Logos became a man (*ἄνθρωπος*), which might be understood as indicating more than could be affirmed. The Logos did not lay aside the essence, but the *μορφή*, of God. He did not pass from the Divine state into that of a mere man. But He entered into human nature, taking upon Himself the *μορφὴ δούλου*. He did not, on the other hand, merely assume the *σχῆμα ἀνθρώπου*, but He became flesh, *ἐγένετο σάρξ*. Precisely what this involved is suggested by the peculiar expression used; but the fullness of the author's idea must, here again, be sought in the subsequent chapters. 8. Not improbably Godet's view of the words *μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός*: that they mean (as rendered in A. V. and R. V.) *the only begotten from the Father*, is correct. But his argument against Weiss, who understands the words as meaning *an only begotten from a father*, and as referring to the only son as inheriting the rank and fortune of his father,—namely, that this explanation would suppose that every father who has an only son has also a great fortune to give him, can hardly be regarded as having any considerable force. We do not measure our thought in such phrases by the lower cases, but by the higher. The glory belonging to our idea of an only son is not affected by the fact that there are many individual instances in which there is no glory for him. 9. The fact that ver. 18 is added at the end of the Prologue, and immediately after ver. 17 (which declares that the revelation of grace and truth, of which in ver. 14 the Logos was said to be full as He became flesh, was made through Jesus Christ), plainly connects the end with the beginning and shows that, in the view of the writer, Jesus is more than a man—that He is the one who is in the bosom of the Father, and who both was with God and was God. 10. It does not seem to the writer of this note that Godet's view of the plan and thought of the Prologue is the true one—that the three ideas are, The Logos, unbelief, faith, the first being presented in vv. 1–4, the second in vv. 5–11, and the third in vv. 12–18. On the other hand, the true view seems rather to be that which has been already suggested. The great doctrine of the book is, that Jesus is what is represented by the word Logos—the Divine revealer of God having entered into our humanity. The Prologue presents as its chief point the two propositions, vv. 1, 14, which contain the statements respecting the Logos, and ver. 17 which adds that concerning Jesus. From ver. 1 to ver. 14 there is a passage subordinate to the two main propositions, which shows the necessity of what is stated in ver. 14. The other two leading ideas of the book are testimony and believing, the former to the end of the latter (see xx. 30, 31)—and these two ideas are suggested in the Prologue, though only in a secondary way. They are

both mentioned; but the former is made more prominent (ver. 6 f., ver. 15, ver. 14 *we beheld*, comp. 1 John i. 1 ff.), because testimony belongs rather to the beginning, and faith reaches its fullness of believing only at the end. Yet the testimony is always to the end of believing on the part of those who hear it—as truly in the case of John the Baptist at the first, as in that of John the evangelist at the last (comp. i. 7 with xx. 31).

VII.

The passage from i. 19 to ii. 11 is the Historical Introduction, as it may be called. The object which it has in view is to bring before the readers the personages who are to act the principal part in the story. The *σημεῖα* are done (*ἐποίησεν*) in the presence of the disciples (xx. 30). In this passage the disciples are introduced on the scene.

As to the disciples here mentioned, they were, not improbably, all of them disciples of John the Baptist. Of the first two who are mentioned this fact is distinctly recorded. Were these two persons present with John on the day preceding that on which they went to see Jesus? This question is not a vital one to our determination of the plan and object of this latter portion of the first chapter. But, if it is answered in the affirmative, it proves the connection between the testimonies of John to which reference has been made on page 497 above. That it should be thus answered is shown by the improbability that they would have taken the course they did if they had heard nothing more from John than the words of ver. 36. The additional unfolding of the idea here suggested, which was given on the preceding day, accounts for the impression produced by the mere pointing to Jesus when He appears again. But without this, there is a blank which needs to be filled. Moreover, as these disciples were temporarily absent from their homes for the purpose of hearing John the Baptist and following him, there is every reason to believe that they were present with him on each day of the time at their command. For this reason also, as well as because of the apparent close connection between the several testimonies of John, we may believe that these two persons had, in like manner, heard his conversation with the deputation of the Sanhedrim. Their going to Jesus, accordingly, is the first instance of *πιστεύειν* which answers to the *μαρτυρία*.

In the verses which contain the first two testimonies of John, 19–34, the following points may be noticed: 1. The record of John the Baptist here is quite different, and for quite a different purpose, from that of the other Gospels. The story of John's preaching as given by the Synoptics, is a representation of the character and substance of that preaching. This is true of the passing allusion to it in Mark, and also of the longer accounts in Matthew and Luke. But to this writer, John is of importance only as related to his testimony, and in the plan of this introductory passage this testimony only bears towards one result. We have not here, therefore, the general utterances of John, but only a few words which he said on three successive days. The circumstances of these occasions, however,

called him to explain his peculiar mission and his relation to the Messiah. Hence it is not strange that he should have used some of the expressions which he used in addressing the people, and the presence here of the quotation from Isaiah, or the allusion to the baptism with water and to the mightier one who was to follow, cannot be urged as, in any measure, inconsistent with the other Gospels, which represent these words as used at a different time. These words must have been often on the Baptist's lips and have been spoken to various hearers. 2. In the second testimony (ver. 30), we find the words already mentioned in the Prologue (ver. 15) alluded to as having been spoken on a former occasion. This was not on the preceding day apparently, for no such words are introduced in the account of that day. We must conclude, therefore, that the hearers present on this occasion, and probably the two disciples, had been also present when John preached before the beginning of what is here narrated. These disciples had been, for a brief period at least, under the educating influence of the forerunner in a certain kind of preparation for belief in Jesus. 3. That the baptism of Jesus must be placed before ver. 19, is clear from the fact that it must have occurred at an earlier time than the day indicated in ver. 29, because of the allusion to it (vv. 33, 34) as already past. But if it preceded ver. 29, it must also have preceded ver. 19, because the forty days of the temptation followed the baptism and during this period Jesus could not have been accessible to others as he was here. Moreover, if He had been baptized on the day mentioned in ver. 19, that is, only a single day before ver. 29, it is scarcely possible that the words used by John the Baptist respecting the event should be only what we have here. 4. As to the meaning of the words *I knew him not* (vv. 31, 33), Godet holds that they declare that John did not know Jesus a man, for if he had known Him thus, he must have known Him also as the Messiah. Meyer, on the other hand, says that this expression leaves it quite uncertain whether he had any personal acquaintance with Jesus. Westcott regards the story in Luke as leaving it doubtful whether any such personal acquaintance existed. But, if the narrative in Luke is to be accepted, it seems almost impossible that John should not have had some such knowledge of Jesus as would prevent his saying so absolutely, I did not know him. The circumstances of Jesus' birth, and of John's own birth as related to that of Jesus, were so remarkable, that John could hardly have lost sight of Him altogether. Moreover, the words addressed to Jesus by John in Matt. iii. 14 are very difficult to be accounted for, if Jesus was altogether unknown personally to him. Weiss attempts to explain the difficulty by supposing that the ἤδειν does not refer to the time of the baptism, but to the time of the verb ἦλθον which follows, that is to say, the time when John entered upon his public office. But this seems wholly improbable in the case of ἤδειν of ver. 33, which occurs in the midst of the account of what he saw at the baptism, and appears to be contrasted with the knowledge which he gained by seeing the fulfillment of the sign—he was without this knowledge even at the baptismal scene, until the moment when he saw the dove descending. It would seem, therefore, that the ex-

planation must be sought for in connection with the idea of the Baptist's testimony, for which the whole matter is introduced. He did not know Jesus, in such a sense that he could go forth as the witness sent from God (ver. 6), and testify that Jesus was the Son of God, until the divinely promised proof had been given. However much the friends, or even the mother of Jesus herself, may have thought of a glorious mission as awaiting Him in life, they could not have felt sure that He was to hold the Messianic office, until they saw the evidences which came with His entrance upon His public career. But John—to be the great witness, giving the assurance of a Divine word—must certainly have waited for the sign, before he could feel that he knew as he ought to know. In this connection, also, it may be noticed that John's testimony seems to take hold, in some measure, upon the thoughts which the writer brings out in the Prologue (comp. ver. 30, *he was before me*, ver. 34, *the Son of God*), and surely, for the knowledge of these things, he needed a divine communication. He may have believed in Jesus' exaltation above himself (Matt. iii. 14) by reason of what he had heard of the story of His birth or the years that followed. He may, thus, have felt that he might rather be baptized by Jesus than baptize Him. He may even have had little doubt that He was the Messiah. But he could not *know* Him as such, until the word of God which had come to him was fulfilled.

VIII.

In connection with the third testimony of John, *the result in believing* is given; the two disciples go to Jesus. With respect to the one of them who is not named, we may notice: 1. That he is, beyond any reasonable doubt, one of the apostolic company as afterwards constituted. This is proved by his connection with Andrew; by the fact that he is undoubtedly to be included among those disciples who went to Cana (ii. 2), and to Capernaum (ii. 12), and so, also, among those who are referred to as being present with Jesus at Jerusalem (ii. 17, 22); and by the fact that in the subsequent history the "disciples," who are made thus especially prominent, are clearly the apostles. 2. That he is particularly connected with Andrew and Peter. He must, therefore, have been one of the apostolic company who had this relation to those two brothers before their discipleship to Jesus began. It appears probable, also, that he is the same unnamed person who has similar intimacy with Peter after their entrance upon their apostolic office. 3. That the only persons whom the Synoptic Gospels present to us as thus united with Andrew and Peter are the two sons of Zebedee. 4. That there is, to say the least, a possible and not improbable allusion to his having a brother whom he introduced to Jesus. If so, the evidence that the two were James and John is strengthened, but this point is not essential to the proof. 5. That, if the companion of Andrew was either James or John, and if he is the one who is alluded to, but not named, in subsequent chapters, there can be no question as to which of the two he was. If he was the author, he could not be James, who was dead long before the book was written. Whether he was the

author or not, James had died too early, as Godet has remarked, for any such report to spread abroad as that which is referred to in xxi. 23. Weiss, in his edition of Meyer's Commentary (as also Westcott and Hort), holds that πρῶτον, and not πρῶτος, is the true reading in ver. 41, and Weiss maintains, that, with either reading, the word does not suggest the finding of the brother of Andrew's companion, but that, on the other hand, it simply marks the finding of Peter as the first instance to which vv. 43, 45, answer as a second and third. Meyer, however, reads πρῶτος, and agrees with Godet, that there is here a reference to James. Westcott, also, who adopts πρῶτον as the text, agrees with these writers in the opinion that James is probably alluded to. It is observed that the indication of the verse is found not only in this word, but also in the emphatic ἴδιον, and in the fact that the verse follows and is apparently connected with ver. 40 (*one* of *the two*—he *first* findeth *his own*), and that the specifying of the finding of Peter as the *first* case of *finding* seems wholly unnecessary, and, considering the separation of the verses which give the account of the other findings from this one, antecedently improbable. Weiss also holds, that the finding of Peter took place on a different day from that of the visit of the two disciples to Jesus. But, while this is possible, it seems more probable that it occurred on the same day at evening, the days being reckoned by the daylight hours. In so carefully marked a narrative, we can hardly suppose a new day to be inserted with no designation of it. The result in *faith* of this first day was a conviction on the part of these disciples that they had found in Jesus the Messiah. Even this conviction could not, probably, in so short an interview, have reached its highest point. On the other hand, as related to the full belief of the later days with respect to all that Jesus was, this must have been only the earliest beginning of the development of years.

IX.

In connection with vv. 43–52 the following points may be noticed:—1. The impression produced upon the mind of Nathanael is occasioned (at least, so far as the record goes), by something beyond what occurred in the other cases. There is an exhibition of what seemed to him miraculous knowledge on Jesus' part. As to what this was precisely, there is a difference of opinion among commentators, as Godet states in his note. That Godet is right here, as against Meyer and others, is rendered probable by the very deep impression which evidently was made on Nathanael, and by the fact that the recording of what Jesus says of him, in ver. 47, can scarcely be explained unless we hold that these words, as well as those of ver. 48, affected his mind.—2. The answer of Nathanael, also, expresses more than what we find in the other cases. He says, indeed, what they say: Thou art the king of Israel (the Messiah). But he also says: Thou art the Son of God. We may believe that this second expression answers to the second element in the manifestation which Jesus made to him: namely, the miraculous insight into his character. Jesus awakened, by this means, a conviction in Nathanael's mind, that He had a peculiar relation

to God; in some sense, at least, a divine side in His nature or character. The view that the title *Son of God* here is simply equivalent to *Messiah* is improbable, when we consider the peculiarities of this story, as compared with the others. But we cannot hold that Nathanael grasped at once the fullness of the significance of this term, as it is used in xx. 31.—3. The words of ver. 52 (51) are evidently spoken with reference, not only to Nathanael, but to all the disciples who were now with Jesus. It is quite probable that, in the plan of the book, they are inserted here as looking forward to all the σημεῖα which are to be recorded afterwards, and which, beginning with the one at Cana, proved to the disciples the union between Jesus and God.

4. That this gathering of disciples about Jesus is quite independent of any story in the Synoptics, and is antecedent to the call of which the account is given in Matt. iv. 18–22, Mk. i. 16–20 and Luke v. 1–11, is evident from the fact that the Synoptic narratives begin the history at a later date. Moreover, the readiness with which the four disciples (Andrew, Peter, James and John) left their business and their homes immediately upon the (Synoptic) call, is almost inexplicable unless there was some previous acquaintance and impression such as we discover here. Meyer affirms that John and the Synoptics are irreconcilable with each other in respect to this matter, because these five or six disciples are with Jesus in ii. 2 and remain with Him. Weiss, in his edition of Meyer, takes the opposite ground. He, however, maintains that we cannot assert that the μαθηταί, who are spoken in ii. 17–iv. 54, are the same with these five or six or that they include all of these. He even goes so far as to say that there is no indication in this chapter that Simon joined Jesus, and calls attention to the fact that in Luke v. 1 ff. the story of the call is centered upon Peter. Both of these writers have taken wrong positions; Meyer, in insisting that no place can be found for the call in John's narrative after the first chapter, and Weiss, in supposing that Peter may not have acted at this time as the others did, and that μαθηταί of ii. 17, etc., is not intended by the author to designate the same persons—or, at least, to give them a prominence—who are mentioned in ch. i. As Keil remarks, the statements with regard to the disciples in the second chapter, if we suppose them to be the same with those mentioned in ch. i., do not exclude the possibility of intervals of separation from Jesus, after their first meeting with Him, and of return to their former employments. It must be borne in mind that John's narrative is a selection of stories made for the purpose of setting forth *proofs* and the *growth of faith*, and not a complete or altogether continuous record of Jesus' life.

X.

Chapter II.

1. The first eleven verses of ch. ii. are evidently connected with the first chapter, because of the continuance of the designation of the days, because of the fact that in ver. 11 the miracle is connected with the faith

of the disciples mentioned, and because the story of the public life of Jesus and His first Messianic appearance evidently begins with ver. 13. The historical introduction, accordingly, closes with ii. 12. The explanation of the design of the miracle recorded in these verses is thus easily seen to be that which the writer indicates in ver. 11; it was to manifest the glory of Jesus before these disciples, to the end of confirming their belief in Him. Any other purpose, such as that of turning the minds of the disciples away from the severities of the old system to the free, joyful service of the new, must have been altogether subordinate and secondary. The book is written for testimony and its results, and the miracle was needed now for testimony. It was of the highest importance that these five or six men, who were to be apostles, should be established in their faith at this time. The character of the miracle was determined, as all the miracles of Jesus' life seem to have been, by the circumstances which presented themselves. So, in this case, it was a miracle at a wedding and a miracle of turning water into wine. That it taught or might teach other lessons was incidental; that it taught faith was the reason for performing it. It was a *σημεῖον*.

As to particular points in these verses, it may be remarked:—1. In the presentation of the story we may see that the writer is guided by the end which he has in view. The circumstances mentioned set forth the striking character of the miracle and its reality, and the narrative also makes prominent the words addressed by Jesus to His mother. The first two of these points have a direct bearing, evidently, on the manifestation of His glory (ver. 11). There can be little doubt that the same is true of the third. The words that are found in vv. 3–5 look towards a miraculous work as a possibility.—2. The answer of Jesus in ver. 4 can hardly be explained, if the request of Mary was only that He would, in some ordinary way, help the family out of their present embarrassment. This was so reasonable a suggestion on her part, it would seem, that He could not have replied to it either with such an element of severity in His words or with such a form of expression. Her meaning, therefore, must apparently have involved something beyond this. The instance most nearly resembling this, in which we find in this Gospel the words "*my* (or, *the*) *hour* (or *time*) *is not yet come*," is that in vii. 6, where the brethren of Jesus urge Him to make Himself known more publicly at Jerusalem. We may believe that, on the present occasion also, there was somewhat of the same thought in His mother's mind. She must have been looking for the time when He would come forward publicly; she must have expected it with increasing interest, and with even impatient desire perchance, as He moved forward in His manhood; she must have thought it near when He left her for John's baptism; she may even have known from Himself that it was near. He had now returned from the baptism with disciples—why should not this be the time? Whether we are to understand, therefore, that she was asking for an exhibition of miraculous power in the particular emergency of the hour or not, it seems impossible to doubt that there was in her mind some call for a display on His part of His

Messianic character and dignity which should go, in its publicity and effect, beyond the company then present, and become in itself the assumption, as if before the world, of His office. The time for this had not yet come. The path which opened to His mind and that which opened to hers were different. He must go forward by slow steps, and begin by simply confirming the faith of the few disciples who were the foundations of His Church.

XI.

Beginning with ii. 13, the account of the first visit of Jesus to Jerusalem is given. There can be little doubt that the five or six disciples were with Him in this visit. Ver. 12 states that they went with Him from Cana to Capernaum, and that they (not He alone) remained there not many days. It is then said (ver. 13) that He went up to Jerusalem; and at the close of each story of what He did there (vv. 17, 22), the relation of His words or actions to the thoughts of the disciples is referred to. When we add to this the evident design of the writer to set forth the growing faith of the disciples in their association with Jesus, the probability in the case rises almost to certainty.

There are four points of special interest connected with these verses (13–25):—1. As the miracle at Cana had by reason of the supernatural power exhibited in it confirmed their faith, two means of a different order are now employed for the same end. The driving out of the dealers is an exhibition of His prophetic zeal. It was the power of the prophet that awed and overcame those who had desecrated the sacred place. The impression made on the disciples was immediate and profound (ver. 17). The testimony comes to them in a new line. As related to the scene at Cana, however, it comes in the right order of proof. The miracle is the first *σημεῖον*, the prophet's work is the second. The matter recorded in ver. 18 ff. is of another character. As we see by ver. 22, it was not fully understood at the time. The scene at Cana and the one with the dealers taught their lesson at once; the disciples believed (ver. 11), and they remembered and applied what was written (ver. 17). But this scene suggested a question which they could not answer. It was a question, however, to which their minds might naturally often turn, and it was one which would lead them to the thought of the wonderful element in His person and character. It worked as a proof by reason of the strangeness belonging to it. What could be the significance of those remarkable words? What a wonderful man must He be who could utter them of Himself! The different character of the signs, as the author brings them before us, may well arrest attention. 2. In respect to the last point (ver. 18 ff.), it is said that the disciples did not come to the right apprehension of the meaning of Jesus' words until after He rose from the dead. In the following verses, persons are spoken of who were led by the signs to believe, but not to believe in such a way that Jesus could trust Himself to them. These statements show clearly that the author is marking in the progress of his narrative

the development of faith. These indications, also, are of such a nature that they point us to an author contemporary with the facts as the one who gives them. They are of the simple, artless sort, which men removed from the actual scenes do not think of. 3. The signs referred to in ver. 23 are not described or related in the chapter. The inference which must be drawn is, that the writer purposely selects those things only which affected the disciples, and those even which moved them in a different way from the miracle, properly so-called, which they had witnessed at Cana. 4. We may add that, at this point, ch. iii. opens with a testimony which lies wholly within the sphere of *words*.

As to the questions arising in connection with these verses, which relate to the difference between this Gospel and the Synoptics, it may be said, in the first place, that both of the two things mentioned seem better suited to the beginning of the public life of Jesus than to its end. The demand for a sign, with the particular answer here given, is more easily accounted for as made on His first appearance, than at the period when, after three years of ministry, He comes to Jerusalem for the last time and enters it with a sort of triumphal procession. It will be noticed, indeed, that in the Synoptical account these words about the temple are only mentioned as what the false witnesses reported that they had heard, and that Mark says, apparently with reference to this matter (comp. Mk. xiv. 59 with 58), that they did not agree with one another in their statements. This may most readily be explained, if the words of Jesus had been uttered two years before. As for the driving out of the traders, on the other hand, the act on the part of Jesus which is here related would seem to be just that which, in the first impulse of His mission, He would be not unlikely to do. It belongs in its character, as we might say, to first impulses, and not to the feelings of that later time when the deadly conflict with the Jewish authorities was at hand. It is, moreover, just such an act as—awakening astonishment by reason of its boldness and the prophetic impulse which characterized it—might naturally induce the leading Jews to ask the newly-appearing prophet what sign He had to show. The difficulty with respect to these points lies, therefore, not in the fact that this Gospel places the occurrences at the beginning of the history, but in the fact that the Synoptics (Matt. and Mk.) place them (or, rather, one of them) at the end. We may not be able to explain this difficulty, but the limitation of the Synoptic narratives may, in some way, have occasioned the representation which they give. Such questions belong, in large measure, with the comprehensive one, as to why the earliest writers confined themselves almost exclusively to the Galilean story.

XII.

Chapter III.

The first twenty-one verses of the third chapter contain the account of the interview between Jesus and Nicodemus. This interview occurred during the visit to Jerusalem at the Passover, and, when viewed in its

close connection with ii. 13–25, it cannot be reasonably doubted that the story is inserted here as a part of the testimony to Jesus. It is the first testimony of the *words*, which play so important a part in what follows, as the Cana miracle was the first of the *works*. On this passage the following suggestions may be offered:—1. It is evident that Nicodemus was one of those whose attention was aroused by the "signs" alluded to in ii. 23. His mind must, therefore, have been in a susceptible state, beyond most of those around him, and he came to Jesus honestly to inquire after the truth. The course taken by him on the occasion referred to in vii. 45–52 makes it probable that he was established in his belief in consequence of, and as following upon this interview. His action at the time of vii. 45 ff., was both honorable and courageous. So was that which is related of him in xix. 38–42. The latter action showed love to Jesus of a most tender order. And yet the mere statement of the author of this Gospel that he made his first visit to Jesus by night has been, as it were, the only thing borne in mind respecting him, and has determined the estimate of his character. The author, however, does not say that this first coming was by night because of unworthy fear, much less that Nicodemus was marked in his whole career by this characteristic. 2. That he visited Jesus with a mind open to conviction, and with an honest desire to hear what He had to say, is evident from the second verse as most naturally explained. There is no reason to believe that his first words were spoken in any other than a straightforward and sincere way. We must believe that some conversation on the part of both parties took place between ver. 2 and ver. 3. It is probable that Nicodemus came to inquire as to what Jesus had to say about the Messianic Kingdom, and that, after introducing the whole conversation by the words of ver. 2, he soon raised the question which he had in mind as to that subject. Otherwise, the words of Jesus in ver. 3 have an abruptness which is almost inexplicable. 3. The idea of Nicodemus with regard to the kingdom was, of course, the ordinary one of the time, according to which it was to be a temporal kingdom for the Jews. The entrance into it was through a Jewish birth, so far as the chosen nation was concerned. Jesus strikes at the very foundation of this idea, and makes the entrance to be only through a birth of another sort—a birth of the spirit. The difficulty which Nicodemus sets forth in the question of ver. 4 is connected with this marvelously new idea, and is to be interpreted accordingly, and not according to the literalism of its words. The state of Nicodemus' mind is that of ver. 9: "How can these things be?" —that is, the new doctrine is incomprehensible. He stood, in this regard, where the Jewish opponents of Paul stood, when he taught the doctrine of justification, not through possession of the law and the being a Jew outwardly, but through a new and living principle, even faith in Jesus Christ. 4. The meaning of the word ἄνωθεν—whether *from above* or *anew* —must be regarded as doubtful. The arguments in favor of the former meaning are: (*a*) The use of the word in the sense *from above* in the only other instances in John's Gospel which can be compared with this case. There are, however, only two such instances. In xix. 23 it is used of the

tunic of Jesus, which is said to have been woven *from the top* throughout. (*b*) One of these two instances is in this present chapter (ver. 31). This fact—although the word occurs in the report of the expressions of John the Baptist on another occasion—would seem to indicate what the writer understood by it. (*c*) The Johannean idea of the spiritual birth is that of being born of God, of the Spirit, that is, *from above*, and not of a new or second birth. Born of the Spirit is an expression found in this very conversation. (*d*) For the idea of a second birth πάλιν or δεύτερον would have been more naturally selected. On the other hand, it is claimed (*a*) that the understanding of Nicodemus was that it was a second birth (see ver. 4); (*b*) that the word was so understood by the translators of the Peshito, Coptic, Old Latin and Vulgate versions; (*c*) that in the passage from Artemidorus, which is referred to by Godet—the only instance in the classics where ἀνωθεν γεννᾶσθαι is used, it has this meaning; so also the adverb in the two other passages cited by Godet in his note from Josephus and the *Acta Pauli;* (*d*) that the use in Gal. iv. 9 justifies this meaning; (*e*) that, if Jesus had here meant *from above*, He would have used the expression ἐκ θεοῦ, instead of this adverb. The tendency of the majority of commentators has been, on the whole, towards the latter view, or towards the position taken by R. V., which places *anew* in the text, and *from above* in the margin. If the second view is adopted, it must be observed—as is now generally admitted—that the word does not mean precisely *again* (πάλιν) or *a second time* (δεύτερον), but, as in Gal. iv. 9, *from the beginning*, as indicating the idea of *beginning over again*, and thus of a completely new birth. The writer of this note would merely express his own view that *from above* is somewhat more probably the correct rendering of the word, because this meaning seems more in accordance with the general Johannean idea of the spiritual life—that it comes, in every sense, from heaven—and also because this is evidently the meaning of ἀνωθεν in ver. 31. That Nicodemus spoke of a second birth does not seem to be the measure for the determination of Jesus' thought. In the bewilderment of his mind as to the words of Jesus, any idea of birth must have seemed to him to suggest a second birth of some sort, and especially as his idea of the kingdom was, that it was to belong to Jews by reason of their birth. Nicodemus was evidently unable to grasp the thought of Jesus with a clear apprehension of it. 5. With reference to ver. 5, the following brief suggestions are offered: (*a*) If we take the conversation as it stands recorded, we can hardly explain the words of this verse, unless they connect themselves with something which might easily have been before the mind of Nicodemus when the interview began. (*b*) This thing must have been outside of his old, Pharisaic ideas, for the whole exposition of the entrance-way and life of the kingdom is clearly intended to take him wholly away from those ideas—to awaken him, as it were, by a startling contradiction of what he had previously had in mind, to a new world of thought. (*c*) The only thing which can have suggested the words here used must, therefore, have been the teaching and work of John the Baptist. That this work and teaching had affected the mind of Nicodemus we may believe because of his

coming to Jesus. His coming, in itself, showed that his attention had been easily turned to the great subject of the kingdom. A mind thus ready could not have overlooked the remarkable work of John, or have failed, if his attention was given to it, to consider the chief elements of John's doctrine. (*d*) One of the striking expressions of John, in setting forth his office and his relation to Jesus, was that respecting baptism with water and with the Spirit. If Nicodemus had known of John's preaching, it would seem that he must have had his attention drawn to this expression. (*e*) In explaining the matter of the entrance into the kingdom, therefore, it would not be unnatural for Jesus to turn the mind of Nicodemus away from his past ideas to the ideas belonging to the Christian system by *uniting* these two words *water* and *spirit*. The work for which the forerunner prepares the way, and which He himself introduces and sets on its course, is that by which men are drawn away from the outward and temporal view of the kingdom to individual spiritual life. (*f*) If there is in the words this uniting of His work with John's, we may easily understand why the word *water* falls away at once and the further development is wholly in the use of the word *spirit*. (*g*) The immediate and primary reference in ὑδατος is, accordingly, not to baptism as found in the Christian system, though, in the fullness of the idea of the sentence in the mind of Jesus, there may have been a secondary reference to it. But whatever may be said as to this point, there can be no doubt that the main thought of Jesus, which was intended to be conveyed to Nicodemus, was that of the spiritual birth as essential to membership in the kingdom. 6. The meaning of σάρξ, as used in ver. 6, is to be limited to the physical idea, and not to be regarded as including the moral. The object of this verse is to confirm, by the contrast here indicated, the necessity of the new birth. The natural birth, as into the Jewish people, can only result in what pertains to the physical or psychical sphere, but the kingdom of God is in a higher sphere. The aim of Jesus is, throughout, to show Nicodemus that his old views were utterly wrong. 7. The thought of ver. 8 is immediately connected with ver. 7. Nicodemus should not marvel at the idea of a new birth of the spirit, for the analogy of nature shows results coming from invisible sources. But it seems not improbable, also, that there is a suggestion here of the origin of membership in the kingdom as being widely different from what he had thought. It is an influence working in an unseen way, which may affect any one of any nation, and may leave any one unaffected—which neither moves along the lines of ordinary birth nor is connected with it. 8. The suggestions already made serve to explain the words of Jesus in the tenth verse. The object of what precedes having been to set forth the spiritual nature of the kingdom, the expression of astonishment follows, that one whose office it was, as teacher of Israel, to comprehend the Old Testament in its deepest meaning, should be so unable to grasp the spiritual idea.

XIII.

1. At ver. 11, Jesus makes a step in advance in the discourse, and now assumes in a more formal way the position of the teacher of this teacher. He declares to him, first of all, that He is qualified to make known to him the truth, because He has seen and knows; He has, what no human teacher has, the heavenly knowledge (vv. 11, 13). But Nicodemus, through dwelling in the psychical rather than the spiritual region, is not ready to receive and believe that which is to be communicated. 2. This want of belief on the part of Nicodemus does not seem to be referred by Jesus directly to sin or the sinful will, as in the case of the Jews afterwards, but to the fact that his thoughts are wholly in the outward and visible, as indicated by his questions respecting the new birth. The conversation apparently is designed to be an educating one to the end of faith, and so there is no sharp rebuke, but only the effort to bring him to see the need of entering into a higher sphere. 3. The *earthly things* must refer to the new birth, because this is the only matter which had been spoken of (*εἶπον*, ver. 12). The spiritual change, though having its origin and originating force in heaven (*ἄνωθεν, ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος*), is yet accomplished on earth. It is, indeed, the earthly work of the new kingdom. The *ζωὴ αἰώνιος* opens and begins here. This was the fundamental thing to be presented in answer to the question with which we may believe the conversation to have been commenced. If this could not be understood, what possibility could there be of understanding the things which were beyond this—the heavenly things? 4. The *heavenly things* must, undoubtedly, be indicated in the words of this conversation—otherwise there would be little significance in mentioning them. If, however, they are thus indicated, they must be found in what follows, and must, apparently, be centered in the mission and crucifixion of the Son of man to the end of the salvation of men. The fundamental fact and truth of the Gospel—the divine provision for bringing men to eternal life through believing on the only-begotten Son—cannot be understood by one who does not apprehend the necessity of the new birth, that is, by one who does not know that the kingdom of God is a kingdom in and over the soul, not to be entered by belonging to a particular nation. The necessity of the new birth may be realized on earth and the new birth is accomplished on earth, but the great divine plan, with its wide-reaching relations, which involves and is carried out by means of this spiritual regeneration, is a thing belonging to heaven, and one which must be revealed by the Son, who descends out of heaven and who is in heaven. Ver. 13 holds, in the thought as well as in its position, the intermediate place between ver. 12 and ver. 14: ver. 12, the heavenly things are mentioned; ver. 13, the Son is the only one who can reveal them; ver. 14, what they are.

XIV.

The passage from ver. 16 to ver. 21 is supposed by Westcott, and by Milligan and Moulton, among the most recent writers on this Gospel, as

well as by the writers whom Godet mentions, to contain reflections of the evangelist on the words of Jesus already spoken. On the other hand, Alford, Keil and others hold that these are the words of Jesus. The grounds on which the former view is maintained are the three referred to by Godet, and one or two others which may be closely united with them. As for these three, it must be admitted that they are deserving of serious consideration. The argument from the past tenses cannot be pressed, as it might be in some other writings, for the tendency towards the use of the aorist instead of the perfect is manifest in the New Testament, and, in this case, the reference in vv. 16, 17 is apparently to the act of love already accomplished, and besides, the ἦν of ver. 19 may be intended to cover a time before the appearance of the light, as well as the time of or after that appearance. The argument derived from μονογενής, to which other peculiar expressions are added by Westcott, such as *do the truth*, is the only one of weight. It would seem not improbable that John may have taken this word from Jesus, but the use of it by Jesus in this early conversation with Nicodemus is a thing hardly to have been expected. Was it not too soon after His first coming forward as a teacher, and was it not unlikely that He would have employed this peculiar term for the first time in a conversation with such a man? The argument derived from the fact that Nicodemus takes no longer any part in the conversation is of comparatively little force, because at ver. 14 Jesus passes from the earthly to the heavenly things, respecting which Nicodemus might naturally have been only a listener to what was told him. The connection of the 16th verse with what precedes by *for* is possible consistently with either view, but, considering the absence of any statement pointing to the writer as giving his own thought, it favors the assigning of the words to Jesus. The natural and easy progress of the discourse, if they are thus understood, and the appropriate close which they form to all that is said, together with the antecedent probability that the evangelist would not so abruptly join his own words to those of Jesus, are the arguments which bear most strongly against those already mentioned. The only instance in which it may be regarded as clear that the evangelist in any such way weaves his own matter into the narrative, is in the latter part of ch. xii., and there he only gives a kind of summary, at the close of Jesus' public work, of His teachings and their results. This, however, is quite a different thing from an immediate joining of his own words to those of Jesus as if they belonged to the same development of thought. It is claimed, indeed, that the writer connects his own reflections with the words of John the Baptist at the end of this chapter. But even if this is admitted, it will be observed (*a*) that ver. 31 is not so closely connected with ver. 30 as ver. 16 is with ver. 15 (ver. 16 opens with γάρ, while ver. 31 has an independent construction); (*b*) that it is less difficult to suppose that Jesus used the words of vv. 16–21, than that John the Baptist used those of ver. 31 ff.; and (*c*) that the writer may more easily be supposed to have been ready to supplement what John said with his own thoughts, than to add words of his own to what Jesus had said. It may be added (*d*) that by thus closely

joining his own reflections to the discourse of Jesus, he must have known that he was not unlikely to mislead the reader, and to make him suppose that Jesus had uttered those central words of the Gospel (ver. 16), which He had not uttered. Is it probable that, in the first case where he presented Jesus' own testimony in words, he would have allowed himself to make such an impression?—While it cannot be said, therefore, that vv. 16–21 are certainly not the words of John, there are strong grounds to believe that they are not, and the probability of the case must be regarded as favoring the assigning them to Jesus.

In the verses of this discourse with Nicodemus we meet, for the first time in this Gospel, the words ζωὴ αἰώνιος. The careful examination of the use of this phrase by this author will make the following points manifest:—(*a*) The phrase ζωὴ αἰώνιος is used as substantially equivalent to ζωή. For example, when Jesus says v. 24: *He that believeth hath eternal life*, and in v. 40: *that ye may have life*, it cannot be doubted that the ζωή of the latter case is the ζωὴ αἰώνιος of the former.—(*b*) The ζωὴ αἰώνιος, according to John's idea, is possessed by the believer as soon as he believes; comp. iii. 36, v. 24, vi. 54. He that believeth *hath* eternal life; he that eateth my flesh *hath* eternal life. It is a thing of the present, therefore, and not merely of the future.—(*c*) That *eternal life* is thus *present*, is indicated by the explanation given by Jesus as to what it is, xvii. 3: *This is eternal life to know thee, the only true God and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.* The knowledge of God is eternal life, and this knowledge the believer has in this world (comp. 1 John ii. 13: because ye *know* the Father, v. 20: we *know* him that is true).—(*d*) The *eternal life* also belongs to the future; comp. vi. 27, the meat which abideth unto eternal life; xii. 25, he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto eternal life; iv. 36, gathereth fruit unto eternal life; v. 29, the resurrection of life.—(*e*) Eternal life, viewed with reference to the future, is connected in thought with expressions containing the phrase εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα; comp. vi. 51, If any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever and the bread is my flesh; vi. 54, he that eateth my flesh hath eternal life; vi. 58, not as the fathers did eat and died, he that eateth this bread shall live forever. The conclusion which we may draw from these facts is, that, to the view of this author, eternal life is rather a permanent possession of the soul than a future reward; that it begins with the new birth, and continues ever afterwards, as well in this world as in the world to come; that it moves onward uninterruptedly, so that there is no sight or taste of death, viii. 51–52. In this sense, the adjective is qualitative, rather than quantitative—eternal life is a peculiar kind of life. But when we ask why this particular qualitative word is used to describe the life, the suggestions of this Gospel lead us to believe that it is due to the fact that the life endures εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα—that it never has any experience of death—that it is endless. The qualitative word is thus also a quantitative one, and is used because it is quantitative. The endless life begins on earth.

The word *judgment*, in these verses, is possibly to be interpreted, with Meyer and others, in the sense of *condemnation* (κατάκρισις), and possibly,

with Godet and others, in its own proper sense. It is not to be doubted that, though κρίσις means judgment, it sometimes has in the New Testament the idea of condemnatory judgment carried into it by the force of the context or of the subject under discussion. This is true of the word *judgment* in our language. That this is the meaning of κρίσις in these verses is indicated by the contrast with the word *save;* by the contrast between believers and unbelievers, so far as the general representation of the New Testament writers sets forth their fate; by the fact that ver. 19 naturally suggests the idea of condemnatory judgment; and by the references to the final judgment as including all men, which are found elsewhere. The other view is favored by the fact that neither here nor in ch. v. 24 ff., is the word κατάκρισις used. This word is, however, found only twice in the New Testament (2 Cor. iii. 9, vii. 3). Κατακρίνω does not occur in John's Gospel, except in the doubtful passage, viii. 1–11. It is to be observed, also, that the tendency of the Johannean thought is towards the inward sphere, rather than the outward; and as his conception of eternal life is not of the future reward or blessedness, so much as of the spiritual life in the soul, never seeing death, so it would seem natural that his idea of the relation of the believer to judgment should be that of having its issues already decided in the soul by the possession of faith, and thus of escaping judgment in its more outward form. While recognizing the force of the considerations in favor of giving to κρίσις the idea of judgment as distinguished from condemnation, the writer of this note believes that the other view is more probably the correct one. Viewed in relation to the decision as to destiny, the believer as truly as the unbeliever, it would seem, must be subject to this decision. In both cases alike, it is made, in the sense here intended, in the man himself. It is made already in each case, and no more in the one than in the other. But if the meaning is condemnation, it is true that the believer is not condemned, and that the unbeliever has been condemned already by and because of his unbelief. The 19th verse supports this meaning, for it represents the κρίσις as being that which is connected only with the rejection of the light, with the loving of darkness, and with the deeds which are evil and are to be reproved (ver. 20). But the κρίσις which relates to such works and the men who do them is a condemnatory judgment.

XV.

On verses 22–30 we may remark: 1. The object of the passage is, evidently, to introduce a final and impressive testimony of John the Baptist to Jesus. The insertion of this testimony indicates the importance which the writer gives, in his own mind, to John as a witness. It is most simply and easily explained, if we suppose that the writer was the unnamed disciple and had gained from John the first and strong impulse towards the life of faith. The emphasis laid upon this testimony and that in i. 19–35 will partly, if not wholly, account for the prominence given to John in the Prologue. We may well believe that these words of their

old master or friend, being brought to their knowledge, strengthened greatly the belief of the five or six original disciples. 2. The statement of the 24th verse may be intended to correct a wrong impression, which readers of the Synoptics might derive from them as to the relation in time between the imprisonment of John and the beginning of Jesus' public ministry. But, whether this be so or not, this statement shows that the portion of Jesus' life which is recorded in these first chapters antedates the Synoptic account of His public work. 3. The words of ver. 27 are best taken as conveying a general truth, which in the present instance finds its application to both of the persons compared. That they have a reference to John himself is indicated by the close connection with ver. 28, where he denies and affirms only with respect to his own office, and with ver. 26, in which his disciples call upon him, as it were, to claim superiority to the new prophet, or at least equality with him. His answer to the complaint and implied demand of these disciples is, that he is content with the position and work assigned to him by God. He takes joyfully what God has given him, though it even involves a decreasing and passing away before the higher glory of Christ. But the words also refer, in his use of them, to Jesus, for it was the application to Him which was calculated especially to bring his disciples to a state of contentment with the present and prospective condition of things. He must increase, because He is the Christ. 4. These verses respecting John, though representing an incident in the country region of Judea after the close of the Passover feast, are so nearly connected with the first visit to Jerusalem, that they may be regarded as belonging, in the author's arrangement of testimony, with what occurred at that time. If we view the matter in this light, we find that the disciples had now received the σημεῖον consisting in a wonderful miracle, the σημεῖον in the strict sense, and, in addition to this, the proofs or σημεῖα given by the remarkable act of the prophet, by the great prophetic declaration respecting the temple, which offered food for thought even until His resurrection made its meaning clear, and by the words addressed to Nicodemus, which spoke to them both of the earthly and the heavenly things connected with the kingdom of God, the knowledge of which on His part showed that He had descended from heaven. Following upon all this, they had heard a last word from John, which answered, as it were, to the first suggestion which had pointed them to Jesus. He had said to them at the beginning, that he was not the Christ but only the forerunner, and had bidden them go and see the greater one for whom he was preparing the way. In the words addressed to his own followers, he now says to these former followers also, that his joy as the friend of the bridegroom is full, and that, while his work is closing, the one to whom they have joined themselves is to increase and to establish the kingdom. The presentation on the part of the author of this testimony in these different lines and the selection of these narratives which contain them are manifestly in accordance with an intelligent plan. But the plan is of just that character which attaches itself to, and finds its foundation in, the remembered experience and development of the inner life.

XVI.

With respect to the question whether vv. 31–36 are a portion of the discourse of John the Baptist to his disciples, or whether, on the other hand, they are added by the evangelist, two suggestions may be offered: 1. In a certain sense, these verses form the conclusion of one section of the book. The testimonies which came to the disciples at the beginning of their course and in connection with the time of the first Passover, and which are apparently arranged with special care by the author, here come to their end. That at such a point the writer should allow himself to pass from the history into reflections of his own, would be less surprising than it would be elsewhere. The passage might be regarded in this respect, as having somewhat of the same position as the summary passage at the end of ch. xii. The case is different with vv. 16–21. 2. The difficulties in supposing John the Baptist to have used expressions such as we find in these verses are much greater than those which are alleged, in vv. 16 ff., as bearing against our understanding that the words there used were spoken by Jesus. It will not follow, therefore,—even if we hold that the evangelist gives his own thoughts and words in vv. 31–36,—that he does the same thing also in vv. 16–21.

The considerations which favor the view that vv. 31 ff. are the words of the evangelist are the following: (*a*) The greater appropriateness of the thoughts to the time of the evangelist's writing, than to that of the Baptist's speaking. The thoughts, it is claimed, are beyond what the Baptist could have had. (*b*) The phraseology is that of the writer of the Gospel, and not in accordance with what we know of John the Baptist. On the other hand, this view is opposed by the very close connection of these verses with those which precede, 27–30; and by the fact, as it is claimed, that there is a marked consecutiveness and coherence in the whole passage viewed as one discourse. Godet affirms that all the details of the discourse are in harmony with the character of John the Baptist. It can hardly be denied, however, that we seem to pass into a new form of expression, as we move from ver. 30 to ver. 31, and that in the latter verse we seem to be in the atmosphere of the evangelist's language. Moreover, ver. 32a is strikingly like ver. 11, and vv. 34–36 bear the stamp of expressions of Jesus which were used at a later time. The words of ver. 32b, on the other hand, are truer to the standpoint of John the Baptist, than to that of the writer near the end of the apostolic age. Perhaps the most correct view of the passage may be, that it is a report of what John the Baptist said, but that, under the influence of his own thoughts of Jesus' work and exaltation, and especially of what He had set forth in His conversation with Nicodemus in the earlier part of the chapter, he was led to express the Baptist's thought with an intermingling of his own language, or even with some intermingling of his own thought. The phenomena of the passage which point, in some measure, in the two opposite directions, would be satisfactorily met by such a supposition. But the entire separation of these verses from the historical occasion referred to in what

precedes can scarcely be admitted, consistently with the probabilities of the case.

The words of ver. 32b, whether used by the Baptist or the evangelist, must be understood in a comparative, not in an absolute sense—this is proved even by ver. 33. There is no serious difficulty in any apparent opposition between this sentence and ver. 29 as compared with ver. 26. Indeed, the difficulty is much greater in case the words are supposed to be those of the evangelist, for the Gospel-message had had wide success before he wrote this book.

The word ἐσφράγισεν of ver. 33 seems to be used in connection with the general idea of the inner life which so peculiarly characterizes this chapter and this Gospel. The testimony of Christ to what He has seen and heard is the witness to the great spiritual truth—the plan of God for salvation and the life of faith (see ver. 16). The man who receives this witness, and thus believes, gives the answering confirmation of his inward life to the truth of God in this which is witnessed. He sets the seal of his own soul's belief to the words of Christ as the words of God, and the union of the soul with God is thus accomplished in the full sense of the word. He who does not receive the witness, in like manner, puts himself thereby apart from God and His life. Comp. 1 John v. 10 ff.: "He that believeth not God hath made him a liar; because he hath not believed in the witness that God hath borne concerning His Son. And the witness is this, that God gave unto us eternal life, and this life is in His Son. He that hath the Son hath the life; he that hath not the Son of God hath not the life."

The last clause of ver. 34, if the reading without ὁ θεός is adopted, is in a general form, and the precise application and meaning are somewhat uncertain. This form of the text is probably the correct one. We must observe, however, that the clause is introduced as a proof of the preceding, that is, a proof of the proposition that he whom God has sent speaks the words of God. The natural evidence of this would seem to be that the Spirit is given to Him without measure, rather than that the gift of the Spirit, when this great gift is made to the world or the souls of believers, is an unlimited one, or that the Son Himself gives the Spirit without limitation. The subject of the verb *gives* is, therefore, probably to be supplied from ὁ θεός of the preceding sentence, and not from the subject of λαλεῖ. For the same reason, the application of the general phrase is to the Son, although there is no αὐτῷ in the sentence. The connection with the following verse, also, serves to show that the thought is of the Father as giving to the Son.

XVII.

If the words of vv. 31–36 are words of the evangelist himself, they are most naturally to be taken as his statement of the truth (as he saw it at the time of writing), which was involved in what John the Baptist had suggested by the comparison between himself and Jesus as the παρανύμφιος and the νύμφιος, and by the words, He must increase. They thus indicate

what he himself thought, afterwards, that the testimony affirmed when fully apprehended in the wide reach of its meaning. If they are, on the other hand, the words of John the Baptist, that prophet must have been granted a vision of the exaltation and work of Christ which was beyond that of his time—a thing which, considering his peculiar office in relation to the Messiah, would not seem impossible. John was not only the greatest of the prophets of the older system, he was the last of the prophets. He was the one who handed over the truth of the Old Testament times, as it were, to the New Testament times; the one who pointed to Jesus the earliest disciples of the new system. Why may it not have been granted to him to see what Jesus was, to know that He possessed the Spirit without measure, and to understand that his own ministration of repentance was to be supplemented and perfected by the ministration of faith? If Abraham, with whom the covenant was originally made, rejoiced in the foreseeing of the day of Christ, and saw it with rejoicing, it would seem by no means strange that John the Baptist might have had a vision which opened to him more than others saw—and that he might have expressed what it brought to his mind, either in the precise words which we find here, or, if not this, in words which could be filled out in their significance by the evangelist while yet moving in the sphere of his thought.

However we may view the words, they suggest an inquiry of much interest—namely, how far may we believe that the faith of the disciples, of whom the author is particularly speaking, had advanced at this time? They had had before them manifestations of His power, His zeal, His outlook on the future, His claim to have descended from heaven, His insight into the nature of the kingdom of God, His view of eternal life as related to faith, and finally they had had a closing testimony of John the Baptist which was, apparently, more full and emphatic than any that he had given them at the beginning. They had thus seen all that they could hope to see, so far as the different kinds of evidence were concerned. But we cannot suppose that their belief as yet answered fully to the abundant measure of testimony which had been given them. What we are told in the Gospels of the slowness of their development in the new life, and in their comprehension of its teachings and mysteries, is altogether in accord with what we should expect from the circumstances in which they were. The strangeness of the doctrine of the spiritual kingdom and all that belonged to it, and the ever-deepening mystery in the character of Jesus, as He spoke to them of Himself and of the eternal life of the soul, must have made belief seem a hard thing oftentimes. They were opening in their life to a completely new world. Every day, every thought almost, brought them to new wonders. How could the inward life, long educated under the Jewish ideas, and with the controlling influence of the temporal and outward view of the kingdom, keep pace in its progress with the evidences which were set before them? The evidences might come rapidly—they might come fully; but for faith to grow to its fullness, they must be repeated again and again, they must work their way into the mind gradually, they must find themselves partially under-

stood at one moment, but partially also only at a later, and perhaps a much later, moment. One manifestation of power or insight may have made them believe as soon as it was given; another may have only suggested questioning, or left them in bewilderment, until the great fact of the resurrection enlightened all the way which led onward to it.

When, however, the testimony was to be recorded, years after the history was ended, it was necessary that it should be given in the words in which it was uttered, and of course, as thus given, it would convey to the reader, who had entered into a deeper understanding of the Christian truth, a proportionally deeper and clearer meaning. To be appreciated as a part of the development of the apostles' belief, it must be viewed from the standpoint of the time in their progress when the words were uttered. When it is claimed that there is no advance of thought in this Gospel, that we reach the end immediately from the beginning, etc., those who make the criticism may be called upon to consider the author's plan and its necessary limitations. He does not propose to prove his doctrine —that is, the great truth that Jesus is the incarnate Logos—by a doctrinal course of argument, as if in a treatise. In such a work, he might have arranged his matter altogether at his own will. But he proves by a biography, and in accordance with a plan which involves two ideas: testimony and answering belief. He must select and arrange, accordingly, within the limits thus imposed. The advance indicated in a book of this character must be found largely in the growth of the *impression* of the testimony, rather than in that of the testimony itself. And even with regard to the impression, the necessities of the biographical element may prevent the presentation of a steady progress. Life, whether external or internal, does not move as the critical mind is disposed to demand that this Gospel should move.

Moreover, as to the presentation of ideas, Jesus had before Him, on the occasion mentioned in the beginning of this third chapter, one of the leading men of the Jewish nation, a man, no doubt, of intelligence and learning—"the teacher of Israel." This man came to test and judge Him as a professed prophet, and to ask Him with reference to the kingdom of God. How can we suppose, in such a conversation, that there would have been no utterance of the deeper truths of the new teaching. That the occasion was near the beginning of the public ministry is a matter of no importance here; the presence of the particular man was the determining point. The man's condition of mind and spirit called for the setting forth of the earthly and heavenly things, and we may believe that it was because they were thus brought forward, that he was gained as a disciple, as he might not have been by another kind of discourse. Another listener, or body of listeners, on another day, might have called for a more elementary or plainer method of instruction. But that other day might as easily have been a year later than this one, as a year earlier. The teaching was determined by the opportunity, not the opportunity by the teaching.

We may also look at the matter in another light. If we conceive of the

discourse with Nicodemus as intended to bear, in the way of testimony, upon the minds of the disciples, or even upon them as being present and hearing it, we may well believe that Jesus thought it fit to give expression to thoughts which they could not yet fully comprehend, but which might find a lodgment in their minds and become seed-thoughts for future growths. Suggestive and always asking for explanation, such words as these must have been, first, a witness for them to some deep life and power in Him who uttered them; then, matter for reflection and further inquiry; then, as something of a similar character was uttered afterwards, a help towards further knowledge; and so continually a means of opening the mind to more light and of strengthening the heart in faith with every increase of knowledge.

In the case of these disciples, who were to be the intimate companions of His life and afterwards the source of instruction and authority in the Church, it was especially important that such seed-thoughts should be given for their future meditation, and this, too, at an early time in their discipleship. We see, in this Gospel, how much higher a place in the sphere of testimony is given by Jesus Himself to the *words* than to the *works*. It would seem that it must have been so, because the system itself was *truth*. These chief ministers of the truth must, therefore, above all others, have been educated by the *words;* and, we may believe, by words which, even from the first, called them to higher things than they were able at the moment to attain. What such a process of education made of the Apostle John, we can see in his writings, and surely, if it moved forward by the repetition of the same truths oftentimes, it was no education without progress. The progress, however, must be found in the testimony and the faith *as working together*.

XVIII.

CHAPTER IV.

With reference to the first eighteen verses of the fourth chapter, the following points may be noticed: 1. The statement of ver. 1, as related to the narrative, is introduced simply as accounting for the occurrence of the incident about to be mentioned. In relation to the plan of the book, however, it seems to belong with other passages in which the writer is at pains to show how carefully Jesus avoided all things which might hasten the final catastrophe before the appointed hour. He moved in all His life, so the writer would have his readers understand, with reference to that hour. 2. The words of ver. 2, which are a correction of the report which came to the Pharisees, can hardly have been added merely for this purpose. There must have been an intention on the evangelist's part to give his readers a fact of some consequence in itself with regard to the work of Jesus. The significance of the fact may possibly be found in the relation of Jesus to John. The baptism of water was the peculiarity of John's office, that of the Spirit the peculiarity of His own. In introducing the

new system, however, it was natural that there should not be an abrupt and entire breaking off of the old. John was the one who opened the way, and the union of what followed with what preceded was through him. This union, in connection with the great symbolic act of baptism, was most naturally manifested by the continuance of what John had done; but the passing away of the old and the entering in of the new, was suggested by the fact that Jesus did not Himself baptize with water, but only with the Spirit.

3. The word *οὕτως* of ver. 6 is to be understood, with Godet, Meyer, R. V., and others, as equivalent to *as He was*, without ceremony. 4. The sixth hour almost certainly means noon here, the reckoning being from six in the morning, the beginning of the Jewish day. This method of reckoning is quite probably the uniform one in this Gospel, but it is not certainly so in every case. In the matter of counting the hours of the day, there is everywhere a tendency to vary, at different times, by reason of the fact that, whatever may be the starting-point of customary reckoning, the daylight hours are those which represent the period of activity and of events. It is to be remembered, also, that the author was living in another region from that in which the events recorded had taken place.

5. The conversation here opens very naturally, and there would seem to be no difficulty in supposing that Jesus may have directly answered the remark of the woman with the words of ver. 10. The difference, in this regard, between this case and that of Nicodemus (iii. 2, 3), is noticeable; in the latter, some intervening conversation must be supposed. 6. The living water of which Jesus speaks in ver. 10 is supposed by Godet to be *the eternal life*, and he refers to vv. 13, 14, as showing this to be the correct view. The words of those verses, however, speak of this water as being a well of water springing up into eternal life. We find also, in the sixth chapter, that the living bread and the bread of life are presented as that which is the means and support of life in the believer. It would seem more probable, therefore, that, in this expression, that which forms the basis and principle of the new life is referred to, than the new life itself. That which Jesus gives to the world—in one view, grace and truth, in another view, Himself as the source of life—may be understood as that to which He refers. 7. The word *eternal life*, in ver. 14, is placed in a parallelism with *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*, and, for this reason, it seems here to be carried forward in its meaning to the future. The thought in this place is of the future and final blessedness, as well as of the present inward life, and the former is thrown into prominence, as the contrast is intended to be between the passing away of the satisfaction coming from the earthly source and the never-ending blessing of the life in union with Him.

8. The turn in the conversation at ver. 16 is somewhat difficult to account for. It must be explained in connection with the progress of the story, and hence we may believe that it has reference to the end which Jesus had in view respecting the woman's spiritual life. In the case of Nicodemus, He met one of the leading men of the Jewish nation, who had

come to ask Him concerning the kingdom of God. Nicodemus' attention had been already aroused and his mind had moved in the domain of this great subject. In the case of this woman, on the other hand, attention was to be aroused, and, both for herself and the people of her city, the wonder of His personality and His knowledge must be brought before her mind. For this reason, partly if not wholly, it may be supposed that He left the words concerning the living water to make their impression, and turned at once to a new point which might even more excite her astonishment and stir her thought. This new point, also, would have a bearing upon her own personal life and awaken her moral sense. Godet thinks that Jesus did not wish to act upon a dependent person without the presence of the one to whom she was bound. The objection which Meyer presents is conclusive—"the husband was nothing more than a paramour." The reply which Godet makes, that the prophetic insight may not have been awakened in Jesus with regard to her antecedents until He heard her reply, "I have no husband," is, as Meyer remarks, "a quite gratuitous assumption," and, it may be added, one which contradicts all the probabilities of the case. The commentators have pursued this woman and her five husbands relentlessly, some of them even making all of the five, like the sixth, not her husbands, and some thinking of separation by divorce from some of them or that she had been unfaithful and forsaken them. But there is no foundation for suppositions of this character, as there is generally none for similar conjectures of one kind or another which, in other cases, a certain class of writers on the Old and New Testaments are disposed to make. Even Meyer, who holds that the five husbands had been lawfully married to her, says *such* a history had already seared her conscience, and appeals to ver. 29 as proof of this. He is obliged to add, however, "*how? is not stated.*" Ver. 29 says nothing about her conscience; it says only that she saw that Jesus knew the facts of her past history. It was His knowledge that impressed her.

XIX.

The evident sincerity and earnestness of the woman in what follows may lead us to believe, that, in the words which are given in ver. 20, she did not intend merely to turn the conversation from an unpleasant subject. Whether she was yet awakened to desire instruction in righteousness from Jesus or not, she no doubt put the question with an honest purpose. The explanation given by Godet here is the more natural one, as compared with those of the writers who go to either extreme of interpretation which he mentions. In the reply of Jesus, the following points may be noticed:—1. The development of the thought here is, as it is in the interview with Nicodemus, determined by the state of mind of the person with whom Jesus was speaking, and by the circumstances of the conversation. At the same time, the conversation moves toward a final result which involves an important testimony, and in connection with this fact the story finds its place among these narratives which are selected

by the author for purposes of proof, and as giving actual proofs which were brought before the minds of the disciples. The great truth of the spirituality of religion is brought out here, as it is in what was said to Nicodemus. But here it is suggested in connection with the matter of worship, instead of the entrance into the kingdom of God, because this was the question which occupied the mind of the one with whom Jesus was now speaking. If, however, God is a Spirit and true worship must therefore be spiritual, it naturally follows, for the mind that moves far enough to comprehend the truth, that the life in union with God must be entered by a new birth of the Spirit. But there is something further here: namely, a distinct declaration of the Messiahship of Jesus. This had not been stated in terms to Nicodemus, or in the scenes at the first Passover, or at the wedding-feast at Cana. In the matter of testimony it was an addition to all that preceded—the word from Jesus Himself saying: I am the Christ. He had said what might imply as much in His words to Nicodemus. He had suggested the thought by His reference to rebuilding the temple, and had given evidence of Messianic power in the first miracle. But now He declares it in a sentence which can have but one meaning. On His return, therefore, from Jerusalem towards Galilee after the first Passover, the last element in the testimony is presented to the disciples—through this chance conversation, as it seemed, in a Samaritan town—which may lead them to be confirmed in their belief that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God.

The reason why this declaration was made to this Samaritan woman, and not publicly in Jerusalem, is explained, on the one hand, by the fact already alluded to—that the "hour" of Jesus was the directing-power of His life in relation to the entire matter of His manifestation of Himself, and, on the other, by the retirement and remoteness from the central life at Jerusalem of this town in Samaria. But for the inner life of the disciples it mattered little where the testimony was presented to their minds, while in the due order of impression its place was necessarily and properly after the testimonies mentioned in the earlier chapters. The declaration now given at the end would naturally throw its influence back, as they thought of it, upon all which had been heard or seen before, and would become a guiding and illuminating power in their reflections on what had occurred, and also on what they might find occurring in the future. We may see clearly, therefore, how the writer follows, in the insertion of this chapter, as truly as before, an intelligent plan.

XX.

With reference to particular points in vv. 21–26 the following suggestions may be offered:—1. In the words of ver. 21 we may see from the outset that Jesus' desire was to draw attention to the spirituality of worship, and it is not improbable that, as the account of the conversation was given to the disciples, it was His design to turn their thoughts also away from the ideas of place, which belonged to their former education,

and to show them, at this early stage of their new life, the great difference between the new and the old.—2. The distinction made between the Jews and the Samaritans in ver. 22 is apparently to be determined as to its precise meaning by the last clause of the verse. It was because salvation was from the Jews, that it could be affirmed that they worshiped that which they knew and the Samaritans, that which they knew not. The latter did not stand on the same ground with the heathen nations. They were not entirely without the knowledge of the only true God. But they were not in the line of the Divine education under the Old Covenant, they did not receive the full revelation which had been made, and they were not the nation in the midst of whom appeared the Christ—to know whom, as well as the true God, is the eternal life. They were moving apart from the light, rather than in the light.—3. The true worship is evidently set in opposition to that of place, and thus to the ideas of both parties. But the added words show that Jesus in His thought goes beyond this mere opposition, and enters into the idea of spiritual worship as considered in itself. The foundation of it is the fact that God is a spirit. He therefore seeks as His worshipers those who worship in that sphere where He Himself dwells. The *πνεῦμα* is the part of man which is kindred in its nature to God, and which is capable of real fellowship and communion with God. It is that part of man into which the Divine Spirit enters by His influence and power. The only full communion with God, therefore, must be in the *πνεῦμα*. But as the *πνεῦμα* of man is in and with him wherever he may be, he must be, as a worshiper, independent of place, so soon as he understands the true sphere and nature of worship. The addition of the word *ἀλήθεια* must also be explained, it would seem, by the contrast with the idea of place. It cannot, for this reason, as well as for those given by Godet and Meyer (that the Jew or Samaritan could offer a sincere prayer, and that it follows so soon after *ἀληθινοί*), have the meaning *in sincerity*. Doubtless, it partakes of the signification of *ἀληθινοί* in this place, and means truth as answering to the true idea.—4. Godet supposes that John may have been present with Jesus and thus have heard this conversation. This is not impossible, though the impression of the narrative is that all the disciples had left Him for the time. That Jesus should have repeated the substance of the conversation to them soon afterwards, would seem very natural. It was an interview so remarkable in its results, indeed, that the disciples could hardly have failed to question Him particularly concerning it, and the truth which He had expressed was so adapted to the needs of their minds that He could not but have desired to bring it before them. There is, therefore, no difficulty in the fact that John is able to report the conversation, even if he was not an ear-witness of it.

XXI.

The following points in vv. 27–38 may be noticed:—1. The impression produced upon the mind of the woman was that which came from the

wonderful knowledge of Jesus respecting herself, that is, her past history. That upon Nicodemus, which led him to go to Jesus, came from the miracles. The influence which induced him to become a disciple, if indeed he became one in consequence of that first interview, was derived from the truth which he heard respecting the kingdom of God. The woman, though her past life differed from that of Nathanael, seems to have been affected by the same manifestation of unexpected knowledge or insight. That she should have personally met the Christ, seems almost impossible to her mind—that one who had exhibited such knowledge might perchance be the Christ, she could not but believe. This divided state of mind, as between the possibility and the impossibility, is expressed by the form of her question (*μητί*) addressed to the people of her city.—2. The words addressed by Jesus to the disciples in vv. 32, 34 do not seem to belong immediately to the testimony contained in this chapter, but they must have offered the disciples matter for reflection in respect to His mission. Vv. 35 ff., on the other hand, called their thought to their own mission as related to His. The interpretation of these last verses must take into account the fact that what is said is evidently suggested by the circumstances of the present scene, and, on the other hand, the fact of the general form of the statement. We may believe, therefore, that, just as the remark of the disciples about eating led Jesus to say what is recorded in ver. 34,—a word which teaches them of His relation to the Father,—so here, the sight of the people who were approaching gives Him a vision of the future and wide-extended work of the Gospel, as the disciples were to carry it forward. The general truth, in each case, is illustrated by what is taking place at the hour of their conversation. As related to the present scene, the disciples have returned in season to see the approaching people who are ready to believe, and perhaps to have part in receiving them as believers; but the work of sowing has been already done by Jesus. He has prepared for the result. And the ordering of the Divine plan in this way is, that they may share together in the rejoicing. This is a picture and representation of the future. So it will be in all their work; they will enter into the labors of others, and, at the end, both sowers and reapers will rejoice. So far as concerns the present scene, the sower is, undoubtedly, Jesus; but, as the words extend in their meaning and application over all the ministry of the disciples, the sowers may be all who have gone before them in the work of the kingdom of God. This twofold and enlarged application of the passage answers, apparently, all the demands of the several verses.—3. The word *ἤδη* is probably to be connected with ver. 35, although there is no serious difficulty in joining it, as Godet does, with the following verse.—4. The phrase *ζωὴ αἰώνιος* in ver. 36 seems to be clearly used in the sense which is common in other writings of the New Testament, but not so in John—that is, as referring wholly to the future life.

XXII.

1. The repetition of the statement of ver. 29 in ver. 39 is confirmatory of the view given in the preceding note of the character and source of the impression produced on the woman's mind. The "many" alluded to in ver. 41 believed because of His word. We have, accordingly, in this whole section from iii. 1 to iv. 42, cases of persons who had their faith awakened by personal communication with Jesus and by listening to what He said. 2. The expression referring to the matter of belief which is peculiar to this case of the *many*, is that they said they knew this man to be *the Saviour of the world*. The testimony of Jesus, as thus indicated, was to the end of the universality of His work. Weiss, in his edition of Meyer's Commentary, holds that this expression is put into the mouth of these Samaritans by the evangelist, opposing thus the view of Meyer who agrees with Godet. But the natural pointing of the words of Jesus with respect to worship is towards the possibility of true worship in the case of any man, and independently of place, and this question of worship was the one which these people were most likely to have discussed with Jesus as the great question pertaining to their nation and the Jews. If in their communications with Him they become convinced of His wonderful character, and had even a glimpse of this independency of place belonging to the true worship, their thought must have gone out beyond national limitations to a universal worshiping of God. That they had a clear and full comprehension of this, as the writer had at the time of his writing, is not probable. Such a supposition is not required by their use of the words. But that they should have expressed the thought, which they must have derived as intimated above, by these words, is not to be regarded as unnatural. Jesus taught His disciples by the suggestion of great thoughts. They had but a feeble grasp of them at the first. At a later time, they entered into deeper knowledge. But the story, as told from the standpoint of the later period, must be interpreted, oftentimes, not from the time of the recording of it, but from that of the events. An illustrative example may be found in xvi. 30. How true to the life are the words of the disciples which are there recorded: "Now we know that thou knowest all things, and needest not that any one should ask thee." And yet, how evident it is that in relation to what His meaning was their minds had, at the most, only a glimmering of the light. Indeed, the very words of Jesus which follow seem to intimate this: "Do ye now believe? Behold the hour cometh, yea, is come, that ye shall be scattered every man to his own and shall leave me alone." The word which He spoke to Peter at the end with reference to His departure to the unseen world, might, in a certain sense, be applied to His life with His disciples in the region of the truth: "Thou canst not follow me now, but thou shalt follow me afterwards." So, in this case of the Samaritan believers, the words which were used were the expression of the first outgoing of their thought beyond the boundaries of their own nation and beyond the Jews. But the appreciation of what salvation for the world was—this could only be gained many

years afterwards. The story tells what they said, and they may well have said these words. The meaning of the words to their minds must be judged of, not by what we know, but by what they knew.

XXIII.

1. The explanation of ver. 44 which is given by Godet and Meyer, is in all probability the correct one: namely, that Jesus made His entrance upon His ministry in Galilee only after He had been at Jerusalem and had, as it were, assumed His office there—and after He had there gained the attention of the people in some degree—because of His knowledge of the general truth stated in this verse. Of the very recent writers on this Gospel, Keil, Westcott, Milligan and Moulton hold that the reference of the words *his own country*, so far as Jesus is concerned, is to Judea, and not to Galilee. He went away from Judea to Galilee, therefore, because He did not find honor in the former region. Westcott even thinks that it is impossible that John should speak of Galilee in this connection as Christ's own country. But let us observe: (*a*) that John does not anywhere state that Jesus had His home or birthplace in Judea; (*b*) that in vii. 41, 42, to which Westcott refers, the people question as to whether He can be the Christ because He comes from Galilee as they suppose; (*c*) that Philip speaks of Him to Nathanael in i. 45 as of Nazareth, and Nathanael, in i. 46, hesitates to believe because of this fact; (*d*) that He is called Jesus of Nazareth in all the Gospels; (*e*) that according to Matthew and Luke, who give the story of his birth at Bethlehem, His childhood's home was Nazareth; (*f*) that the proverb here used is referred by the earlier Gospels to Nazareth; (*g*) that the words: He came to his own, i. 11, which are sometimes referred to as favoring the idea that Judea is meant here, have no real force as bearing upon the question, *first*, because all the Jews were "His own" and not merely the Judean Jews, and *secondly*, because, if this be not so, there is evidently in those words no exclusive reference to His first visit to Jerusalem, but, on the other hand, a pointing to the whole attitude of the Jews, especially the leading Jews, towards Him. The relation of Jesus to Nazareth is presented in such a way in all the Gospels—this one as well as the earlier three—as to show that it was evidently looked upon as His home and that Galilee was His country, notwithstanding the fact that His birth had taken place at Bethlehem. 2. Ver. 43 takes up the narrative from vv. 1, 2 of this chapter and carries on the story of the return to Galilee, which had been interrupted by the account of the meeting with the woman of Samaria, etc. Those first verses intimate that Jesus had had very considerable success in Jerusalem and Judea—He was making and baptizing, it was said, more disciples than John. Ver. 45 indicates the same thing. The connection of the verses is, therefore, unfavorable to the view that the proverb is introduced here as referring to Judea. Weiss, on the other hand, holds that the connection here is with the matter of leaving Samaria, and he explains the 44th verse by saying that Jesus leaves Samaria, where He had already gained honor (ver. 42), to labor to the end

of gaining it in Galilee—the disciples were to be left to reap the harvest in Samaria, while He was to go as a sower to a region where, according to the proverb, the foundation work was still to be done. But, in addition to what Godet says against this view, there is every reason to believe that the disciples accompanied Jesus into Galilee. The connection of this statement with the idea of sowing and reaping (vv. 35–38), is quite improbable. Those verses contain an incidental saying suggested by the circumstances of the visit to Sychar. But now the story moves on to an entirely new matter, and it is not to be believed that the writer would expect his readers to think of such a connection, without bringing it out more clearly in what he was writing.

XXIV.

With reference to vv. 46–54 it may be remarked: 1. The writer seems purposely to introduce the allusion to the former miracle at Cana. He is about to close that portion of his narrative which is, in any sense, united with the story of the first visit of Jesus to Jerusalem. The closing section of this part is a miracle wrought by Jesus, and in the same region where the story began. We may believe that this miracle set its seal upon the faith that had grown up in the minds of the disciples in connection with all the testimony which had now been received by them, as the former one had established the beginning of their belief, founded upon the first sight of Jesus. The careful arrangement of the author's plan, as related to the bringing out of the two ideas of testimony and belief, is seen again here, as it is both before this and afterwards. 2. That this story of the healing of the son of the royal officer is not to be identified with that in Matt. viii. 5 ff., Luke vii. 2 ff., is maintained by most of the recent commentators on this Gospel. The main points of difference, which are certainly very striking, and which bear upon all the elements of the story, are pointed out by Godet. In the case of two stories of common life, where the sick person was in one a son, in another a servant; where the disease was in one a paralysis, in the other a fever; where the person performing the cure was, in one, at one place, and in the other, at another; where all the words used on all sides were different; where, in one, the petitioner for the cure urges the physician to hasten to his house that he may cure the sick person before it is too late, and, in the other, tells him that it is unnecessary for him to go to the house at all; where in the one the petitioner finds the sick person healed on the same day on which he makes his request, and in the other only learns the fact on the next day; and where, to say the least, there is no evidence that the petitioner was the same person in the two cases, but, on the other hand, he is described by different words, and all his thoughts as related to the matter are different, it would be supposed that the two stories referred to different facts. But we are not expected by the exacting critics to deal with the New Testament narratives in this way. Weiss thinks that the oldest form of the Synoptic narrative is here found in Matthew and that he means by *παῖς son*, (not *servant*), that is to say, the *υἱός* of John, and that Luke misapprehended the meaning, and called the *παῖς*,

δοῦλος. May not Weiss himself possibly have misapprehended the meaning? Luke's advantages for determining this question would seem, on the whole, to be equally great with those of a scholar of this generation. But while Luke did not know that the sick person was a son, and not a servant, he is, according to Weiss, nearer the original source than Matthew, in saying simply that he was sick and near to death, instead of saying that he had paralysis. John, however, we may observe, moves off in another line, and thinks he had a fever. The reconstruction of the Gospel narratives must be admitted to be a pretty delicate task, when it has to make its winding way through the work of bringing two such stories into one. 3. The part of this passage which is most difficult to be explained is the 48th verse. The father who comes to Jesus seems to give no indication of any want of faith. On the contrary, his coming is, in itself, apparently an evidence of faith. Ver. 50 shows that he was ready to believe, even on the foundation of Jesus' assurance that his son lives, and without any movement on Jesus' part towards Capernaum. Immediately on his return home, and on seeing the fulfillment of the word of Jesus, he becomes His disciple. It is possible, indeed, that this word of Jesus in ver. 48 was the turning-point for the nobleman from a weak towards a stronger faith; but nothing in the narrative clearly indicates this. It is possible, on the other hand, that this call for miraculous aid turns the thought of Jesus to the general state of mind of the people, and that He has reference to this only in His words. But the words πρὸς αὐτόν, and the difficulty of supposing that He would address a man under such circumstances in this way, when the man's faith was not at all of the character described, are serious objections to this view. Probably we must explain the verse by combining both views, and at least find in the bearing of the words upon the man himself some designed educational influence as to the true nature of faith. 4. The miracle here wrought differs from the one recorded in ii. 1–11, in that it was wrought at a distance. It is in this respect that it gives a new testimony, and for this reason, as we may believe, it is introduced into the narrative. The other points in which its character varied from that of the one in Cana were less important for the writer's purpose.

XXV.

CHAPTER V.

The conclusion to which Godet comes with regard to the feast mentioned in the first verse—that it was the feast of Purim—is probably, though not certainly, correct. This feast will meet satisfactorily the fact of the absence of the article (which seems to be the original text), and the apparent demands of the narrative with respect to time. In a story which, notwithstanding the fact that it is evidently planned on the principle of selection, yet follows carefully the chronological sequence of events, it is scarcely possible that a whole year between this first verse (that is, what happened at the time of this feast) and vi. 4, would be

altogether omitted. But this would be the fact, if this feast was a Passover. The same would be the case, substantially, if it was Pentecost. At the time of the other feasts of the year in which the first Passover occurred, Jesus had probably (according to the impression of the narrative) been absent from Jerusalem. The feast here referred to, must, therefore, have been either the Passover or Pentecost, if it was one of the more prominent feasts. The objections to the view that it was Purim do not appear to have special weight. As for the allusion to such a minor feast, it is to be observed that the narrative is not given for the occasion, but for what occurred. The miracle and the discourse belonged to the testimony. They must be recorded, of course, whenever they happened to occur. As for the presence of Jesus at this feast and His absence a month later at the Passover (vi. 4), His action, provided He was absent at the latter festival, may be accounted for in connection with the plan of His life and work. The appointed hour was not to be hastened. Keil is undoubtedly correct in saying that all which can be positively affirmed is, that the feast occurred between the Passover mentioned in ii. 13 and the one alluded to in vi. 4. But we may go beyond positive affirmations, and may look for probabilities. Looking at these, we find that the limits within which it may be placed are December and April (iv. 35 and vi. 4), and this fact points towards the feast of Purim.

With respect to the miracle and the man on whom it was wrought, the following points may be noticed: 1. The peculiarity of the miracle, as distinguishing it from the one mentioned in iv. 46 ff., is found in the long continuance of the illness. This miracle does not seem, however, to be recorded for its own sake, so much as with reference to the discourse to which it gave occasion. 2. It is held by many writers, that the words which Jesus addressed to the man, when he met him again after the healing: "Sin no more, lest a worse thing come upon thee," prove that the man's disease was occasioned by his sin. While this may be the fact, it is yet not certainly so. Jesus is evidently comparing the penalty of sin with the sickness. But it is not necessary, for this reason, to hold that the sin caused the sickness. Is He not rather urging him to become free from the spiritual malady in which he, like other men, is involved, as he had become free from his physical malady? The evidence that the bodily maladies referred to in the Gospel narratives were generally occasioned by special sins on the part of the individuals concerned, is very slight The opinion that such is the case is, substantially, founded wholly upon conjecture. 3. The fact mentioned in ver. 13, that the man was cured by Jesus without knowing who He was, is one which strikingly marks this story. It must have affected the minds of the disciples, as their thoughts, full of wonder, were turned more and more towards what Jesus was and what He was doing. 4. The opposition of the Jews is represented as excited by two things: first, by Jesus' violation of the Sabbath, and secondly, and in a still higher degree, by what His defense of Himself against their first charge seemed to them to involve. This last matter is evidently the starting-point for the discourse which follows, and thus it is in connec-

tion with this point that the whole substance of this chapter—both in its earlier and its later portion—is introduced. The idea which these Jews had of Jesus' claims is an important element in the chapter, as related to its thought.

XXVI.

There can be no reasonable doubt that what the Jews charged upon Jesus was, that He made Himself equal with God—*ἴσον τῷ θεῷ*. To this charge it is, that He addresses Himself; and the question of the chapter is, whether He accepts their understanding and defends His claim, or whether He explains Himself as not affirming what they allege, and thus escapes their charge by placing Himself in a position, not of equality with God, but of inferiority to Him. In connection with this subject, there are some points of special interest which may be noticed.

1. Viewing the book in the light of its plan, we may observe that, in the gradual development of the proof that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, the Divine Logos, the matter of His equality with God is the highest point. We should expect it to be brought forward as the latest rather than the earliest thing, and to be set forth by progressive testimony, rather than all at once. This would be a thing especially to be expected in a book in which testimony and proof were intended to move, in any measure, along with experience. The phenomena of the book are in accordance with what we should thus expect. The testimony of various sorts to various ends, which have been already referred to in these notes, have all been presented before this one is first introduced. The development of the testimony with reference to this point, on the other hand, is progressive. We do not find it, and cannot expect to find it, in its full presentation, in the present chapter.

2. The portion of the proof which is given here is suggested, as it naturally must have been, by the circumstances of the case. The work performed was that of healing, accompanied by a turning of the thought of the one who was healed to the new spiritual life. Jesus calls the thoughts of the Jewish adversaries, therefore, to the work which He has to do with relation to men and to the great question of judgment and salvation. These things pertain to His Messianic office in respect to which He is the messenger of the Father to the world, His commissioned agent for the carrying out of His plan. He presents Himself necessarily, therefore, with a certain element of subordination. But, with this element of subordination essentially connected with His office, there is set forth equality. The Son does what the Father does; even the greatest of all works, in the sphere of thought which is opened,—the gift of spiritual life and the final judgment are even wholly in the hands of the Son; the resurrection and the eternal destiny of all are in His power. And men are to honor the Son even as they honor the Father. What could have been the thoughts of His adversaries, as they heard these claims to equality in working and in honor, except that He actually assumed to Himself that equality which they had charged Him with assuming?

They could not have believed that He was explaining away the offensiveness to their minds of His words in ver. 17. They certainly did not believe this, as we see by the later chapters in the narrative.

3. They did not claim that He made Himself the same with the Father, but equal with Him. It must be observed that the evidences for His claims are such as, when taken in connection with their charge, were calculated to impress them with the conviction that He was supporting His assumption of the equality of which they spoke, and not putting Himself on a lower position. The miraculous works—even greater things than they had seen—and the Old Testament Scriptures were His witnesses. He even declared that He did not look to human testimony. The appeal to such evidences after such a charge, the declaration even that the Old Testament had its meaning and end in Him, could not have sounded in the ears of those hearers as a withdrawal of any claim to that which they had accused Him of claiming.

4. What must have been the thought of the five or six earliest disciples, as they added these words which rested upon this miracle to all that they had heard or seen before. Certainly their thought must have moved forward to higher ideas of Jesus, and what He now said must have made them wait eagerly and wonderingly for further revelations.

XXVII.

The discourse of Jesus is made by Godet to consist of three parts. Perhaps, it may better be divided into four. From ver. 19 to ver. 30, Jesus evidently gives His answer to their charge and explains His powers and office. From ver. 31 to ver. 40, He gives the evidences on which He rests in His declarations respecting Himself. From ver. 41 to ver. 44, He sets before them the reason why they will not accept Him for what He is—it is because they have not in their hearts the love of God. From ver. 45 to ver. 47, He points them to the final issue for themselves of their rejection of Him, and declares that it will be the author of the books containing their own law, who will be their accuser before God and whose writings will be their condemnation.

XXVIII.

Vv. 19–29.—1. The reference in ver. 19 ff., to the union between the Son and the Father is to the complete union in working, which is founded upon love, and upon the immediate seeing of what the Father does which is connected with this love, and to that subordination in love, with respect to His earthly work, which necessarily appertains to Him as fulfilling the commission of the Father. No subordination beyond this is necessarily indicated by the words. 2. The answer which Jesus makes to the Jews is, therefore, not a denial of His equality with God, but an affirmation that, in His work alluded to, what He claims for Himself is only in harmony with God's plan and is in the union and subordination of love to

Him. 3. The thought is especially turned to the great work of the Son in reference to man. There seems to be no ground for doubting that the word ζωοποιεῖ, as used at the end of ver. 21, refers to spiritual life, and that it is this subject which is spoken of in vv. 24–27. The thought is thus connected with that in iii. 17 f., though the development of it is not the same, but is determined by the circumstances of the case. The words "and now is" of ver. 25, and the addition of the words "in the tombs," "come forth," and "resurrection of life," etc., in vv. 28, 29, which are not found in the earlier verses, can hardly be explained except as we hold that there is a turn of thought towards the future judgment at ver. 28, which has not been referred to until that point. 4. The use of the word *judgment* in this passage 24–27, as also vv. 28, 29, is kindred to that in iii. 17 ff. The same reasons, substantially, may be urged for giving the sense of condemnatory judgment to the word, as were presented in the note on the former passage. The manifest reference to the final judgment in vv. 28, 29, taken in connection with the general representation of the judgment in the New Testament, makes this distinction between favorable and unfavorable judgment altogether probable here.—5. The judgment alluded to in the earlier verses is, as it were, anticipatory of that mentioned in the later ones. This use of the word belongs in connection with the general idea presented in this Gospel, and brought out in this passage, that the eternal life begins in the soul when the man believes, and is not only a future possession to be hoped for, but a present one already realized. The judgment, in this sense, is a thing already accomplished, both on the favorable and unfavorable side. When the spiritually dead hear the voice of the Son of God, they pass out of death into life; when the physically dead hear His voice, they also pass into life,—but the latter passing into life is only the consummation of what is designated by the former. The decision is really made in the act of believing. The life moves forward from the moment of that act, and the last step in the process is only like all the others—a step in a progressive development. The same is true, on the other side, of the one who does not believe.—6. The words υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, being without the article, are best taken as indicative of quality, rather than as equivalent to the same words with the article. At the same time, they do not exclude the Messianic idea. To the Son is given the authority to execute judgment because, as the Son of man, He is a son of man. This relationship which He has in nature to those who are to be judged is the ground on which, in the great plan of salvation, He is made the judge, and the question of life and death is made dependent on belief in Him. The qualitative character of the expression υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρ., including at the same time a certain reference to the title-character which belongs to the words when the article is added—this is, not improbably, the combined idea which is to be found in the two other cases in the New Testament, which are similar to this; comp. Rev. i. 13, xiv. 14. But in those passages, the influence of the words in Dan. vii. 13 may be more direct and manifest, and accordingly the explanation given here is less strongly indicated.—

7. Weiss holds, with respect to the last words of ver. 29, that the resurrection of those who have done evil is only for the purpose of the condemnatory judgment, and that thus, both here and elsewhere in the New Testament, no resurrection of the evil-doers, in the proper sense of the term, is spoken of—that the term as applied to them is to be understood only, as it were, κατ' ἀντίφρασιν. The doctrine of the resurrection of the unbelieving and evil portion of mankind is set forth, indeed, only in a few passages in the New Testament, and in these only in a general way. It seems, however, to be stated distinctly in Acts xxiv. 15, apparently also in this place, and possibly in 1 Cor. xv. 22. Passages such as Phil. iii. 11, Luke xx. 35 may be explained without involving an opposite doctrine. That the resurrection should be mainly referred to as connected with the righteous, is not strange, for it was for them the consummation of the blessedness of that life to which the New Testament writers would turn the thoughts and hopes of men.

XXIX.

Vv. 31–40.—1. The presentation of the testimony on which He rests His claims is opened by Jesus with the words of ver. 31. These words must be interpreted in connection with viii. 14, and must therefore be understood as conveying the idea, that, if the only witness which He has to offer is His own, He is content to be judged by the ordinary rule. Such, however, is not the fact. He is supported by the testimony of another, and that other even God Himself. Being thus able to appeal to this highest of all testimony, He is also able to say (viii. 14) that, though in a given case He actually bears witness of Himself, the witness is nevertheless true.—2. That the ἄλλος of ver. 32 is God, and not John the Baptist, is indicated by the reference to THE testimony in ver. 36, which clearly points back to this verse, and by the evident parenthetical and subordinate character of the reference to John. This reference to John, however, is quite significant, especially in connection with the prominence given to John's testimony in all the earlier part of this Gospel. The witness of John would have led these Jews to the truth, if they had suffered themselves to be influenced by it. It was a divinely-appointed testimony—preparatory and at the foundation. But it was not that on which Jesus rests and that which proves the truth. This latter is the testimony which comes from God only.

3. The testimony which comes from the Father is manifestly declared, in the first place, to be that of the miraculous works. Whether there are two other forms of testimony referred to, or only one, it is somewhat difficult to determine. That which is given in the Old Testament Scriptures is distinctly set forth; and this may, not improbably, be all that is intended by the words of vv. 37–40. It may be, however, that in ver. 37 there is a reference to something else—which, as it would seem, can be only the voice of God in the soul. The latter is favored by the fact that the direct mention of the Scriptures does not occur until ver. 39, and

even an indirect allusion to them is not apparent until ver. 38. The words, "Ye have neither heard his voice at any time, nor seen his form," may be regarded as pointing in the same direction. On the other hand, had this reference to the Divine voice in the human soul been intended, it would seem natural that it should have been brought out with greater fullness and clearness. On the whole, the reference to the testimony in the Scriptures may be regarded as covering all that is said in vv. 37 ff., and the words of ver. 37b may be taken in a semi-figurative sense, as implying that they had not really recognized God in His true teaching and the pointing of His revelation towards the Messiah and the Messianic kingdom, when they read and searched the Old Testament writings.—4. The verb ἐρευνᾶτε is, in all probability, an indicative. The development of the thought does not suggest a demand or exhortation, but a statement of their failure, through unwillingness, to appreciate the testimony of the book which they themselves were always looking into and the study of which they demanded.

5. The two testimonies which are here set forth—the works and the Scriptures—bear witness, the first as, in the strict sense, a σημεῖον which made known the power of God as possessed by Jesus; the second, as showing that the indications of the Old Testament all looked towards such a person and teaching and work as they now saw before them. To announce the coming of this Messianic era and the Messiah Himself, John the Baptist had appeared and given his witness to them. He had aroused their attention and interested their minds for the time. He had thus, as it were, opened the door for them to appreciate the new testimony presented in the works, and to understand fully the old testimony contained in the Scriptures. That they did not yield to the force of the testimony, either old or new, was indisputable proof that they had not the word of God abiding in them—that they had really never seen or known Him in His revelations—that their will was not to receive the witness which was given.

XXX.

Vv. 41–44. The reason of their failure to accept the evidence presented to them is set forth, in these verses, in two forms. The first and fundamental reason is the absence of the true love of God in their hearts. The second reason, into which the first developed itself in its special manifestation, is the unwillingness to accept a Messiah who did not come in the line of earthly glory. The views of a temporal kingdom, as they held them, were connected with the selfish desire of exaltation. They were ready to receive one who came to them with no testimony but his own, and in his own name, if he only met these earthly views. But to the Divine testimony, whether in the sacred writings, or in the wonderful works, or in the words of the forerunner, they were unwilling to listen, because the one to whom all this witness was borne appeared among them simply as the messenger of God to tell the Divine truth, and by making known the true eternal life, to bring all who heard Him to personal righteousness and the

possession of the kingdom of heaven within themselves through believing on the Son of God.

XXXI.

Vv. 45–47. 1. Meyer and Weiss hold that the last judgment is not referred to in these verses, because Christ is represented as the judge on that day, and therefore cannot be spoken of as an accuser in connection with it. Keil affirms the opposite, saying that, as the Jews did not acknowledge Jesus to be the Messiah or the judge, this consideration can have no weight in the decision of the question. The true view of this matter is, not improbably, to be found as we observe the peculiarity of the thought of this chapter and of other parts of this Gospel which are kindred to it. This writer does not leave out of view the final judgment, but his mind moves in the sphere of the present and permanent inward life, and the end is only the consummation. In a certain sense, therefore, judgment is present, though it is also in a certain sense future. The mind of the hearer or reader is left to pass from the one to the other, and thus to include both. 2. Moses is here spoken of as the foundation of the Jewish legal system and thus as, in a sense, the foundation or centre of the Old Testament. It may be that, according to this view of the matter, he and his writings are referred to as if including the whole idea of the Old Testament Scriptures; see ver. 39. If the reference is to the Pentateuch only, the allusion is doubtless to Deut. xviii. 15, and the other points which Godet mentions in his note.

That this first formal discourse of Jesus, which is recorded in this Gospel, is intended by the evangelist to serve as testimony to his readers cannot be questioned. That it is, in this respect, an advance upon what has preceded, is also clear. The relation of Jesus to the Father is here set forth —not indeed as fully as it is in later chapters, but in a part of the unfolding of its true idea, and as it is not in the conversation with Nicodemus. The occasion on which this discourse was given, it must be remembered, was a year, or nearly a year later than that conversation, and much must have been done and said by Jesus in the interval. That Jesus in the opening of the second year of His ministry should have advanced in His teaching as far as this discourse might indicate, cannot justly be regarded as improbable. It was, moreover, with the leading Jews that He carried on this discussion, not with the common people. If the deeper truths respecting His person and His relations to the Father were to be set forth in His earthly ministry at all—and how strange it would have been, if no such declaration had been made,—it would seem that, at this time, the beginnings of the full teachings might appear. The discourse of this chapter stands no less truly in its legitimate and natural historical position, as related to the teachings of the chapters which precede and follow, than it does in its proper place in the progress of the testimony, which the author brings before his readers in proof of the great doctrine of his book.

BOOKCRA
by J.E. Mc

FAMILY OF FAITH COLLEGE LIBRARY
the Gospel of John.
BS2615.66
3480400006215